THE ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH

BS1225
.4.W644

HAROLD M. WIENER

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 20 1911
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Division BS1225
.4.W644

Studies in Biblical Law

By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL. B.

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW
FORMERLY A SENIOR WHEWELL SCHOLAR OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

A valuable volume, in which he [the author] criticizes, with damaging effect, much of the treatment by the Wellhausen school of the laws of the Pentateuch, and shows much cause for distrusting, for example, some of Dr. Driver's arguments on the subject.—The very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, in *The Churchman.*

As a whole, these "Studies" are of unusual worth. They accomplish for certain Old Testament themes what Greenleaf, Lyttleton, and West did in New Testament lines.—*Review and Expositor.*

It is bold and refreshing . . . . our writer goes over ground trodden nearly two thousand years ago by the sages of the Mishnah; but he strikes out his own line and stands forth much more logical than the old Pharisaic doctors.—*New York Evening Post.*

There is no doubt that in this examination of the Biblical jural laws Mr. Wiener has opened up a new and valuable source of information as to the dates of the various books of the Pentateuch.—*Academy.*

. . . . both novel and interesting. . . . The method employed is an ingenious and skillful application of the principles of legal interpretation to texts in apparent conflict.—*Harvard Law Review.*

Altogether the volume is one of great importance and value.—*Bibliotheca Sacra.*

The work . . . . convincingly shows the necessity and certainty of a speedy broadening of the horizon of inquiry in critical Bible study.—*Watchword and Truth.*

LONDON: DAVID NUTT, 57-59 LONG ACRE

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism

By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.
OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW
AUTHOR OF "STUDIES IN BIBLICAL LAW"

255 pages, 8vo, cloth

He [the author] has brought together in this volume a mass of learned observation and argument which cannot be disregarded, and we await with interest the answers which it claims in detail from the representatives of the critical school in this country.—Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, in *The Churchman*.

No one can face this argumentation and continue to hold the Wellhausen divisive theory concerning the Pentateuch without finding for himself what is for him a sufficient answer thereto. Self-respect could allow no less.—Prof. M. G. Kyle, D.D.

The author shows himself a serious and painstaking scholar, and here launches a formidable attack against the widely accepted Documentary Theory as to the origin and structure of the Pentateuch. . . .—Principal G. S. Clemens in *The United Methodist Magazine*.

These Essays deserve the careful consideration of all those who . . . . desire to know whether the Higher Critical position is tenable or not.—The Rev. W. St. Clair Tisdall, D.D., in *The Record*.

The book is a most important contribution to the criticism of the Pentateuch.—*The Tablet*.

An interesting volume . . . . contributing to all points not merely the negative work of criticising critics, but the more difficult and positive effort of personal interpretation. . . . The style is simple and clear, so that it is a book to be appreciated by a very large class of readers.—*The Catholic World*, October, 1910.

We have on the main question of its subject matter only words of praise for this acute and diligent student. The clarity with which he exhibits the uncertain textual basis of the documentary hypothesis, particularly in the matter of the divine names, deserves the highest praise, and, though not a new indictment against that hypothesis, is probably for the first time given an adequate and systematic treatment.—Prof. J. Oscar Boyd in *Princeton Review*.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY
OBERLIN, OHIO U. S. A.
LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK, 62 PATERNOSTER ROW, E. C.

The Origin of the Pentateuch

THE ORIGIN
OF THE
PENTATEUCH

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
OCT 20 1911
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

BY

HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.,

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

Author of "ESSAYS IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM,"
"STUDIES IN BIBLICAL LAW," ETC.

LONDON: ELLIOT STOCK
62, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.
OBERLIN, OHIO, U.S.A.
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY
1910

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

CONTENTS

I. THE HIGHER CRITICISM 7
Difficulties of the Pentateuch 7
The Story of Joseph 8
The Narratives of the Tent of Meeting 9
The Priesthood 10
Other Legal Difficulties 10
Other Difficulties 11
Astruc and the Documentary Theory 12
The Critical Method Exemplified 13
The Current Documentary Theory 14
The Development Hypothesis 16

II. THE ANSWER OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM . . . 18
The Materials for the Textual Criticism of the Pentateuch 18
The Septuagint 19
The Discrepancy in Exodus xviii. 5 ff. 20
The Legitimacy of Textual Criticism 21
The Need of Caution 23
Other Greek Versions 23
The "Priests" of Exodus xix. 24
Aquila and the Tetragrammaton 25
Other Versions 25
Astruc's Clue Tested 25
The Impossibility of Effecting a Clean Division . 26
The Redactor's Conduct 27
The Textual Objection 28
Some Illustrations 30
The Importance of the Argument 30
The Discussion in the *Expository Times* . . . 31
Professor Schlögl's Contribution 36
Dr. Skinner's "Genesis" 36
Professor Toy's Admissions 37
Other Tests of the Clue 37
The Attitude of the Higher Critics 38
The Meaning of Exodus vi. 3 39
Glosses in the Massoretic Text 40
Critical Bearings of Glosses 41
Colenso on the Family of Judah 43
The Answer to Colenso 44
The Story of Joseph 46
Korah, Dathan and Abiram 48
Derangements of Order 49
Other Transpositions 52
The Tent of Meeting 53
Joshua's Supposed Priesthood 55
The Numbers of the Israelites 56
The Chronology of Numbers 57

III. THE ARGUMENTS FROM LAW AND HISTORY . . 58
The Interpretation of the Laws 58
An Unanswered Challenge 59
Wellhausen on Sanctuaries 60
The Answer to Wellhausen 62
Sacrifice without Theophany 62
House of God and Lay Altars 63
The Triple System of Offerings 65
The Pilgrimages in JE 66
The Self-consistency of the Legislation . . . 66
The Priests and Levites 67
The Wellhausen Reconstruction 67
Ezekiel 68
Attractiveness of this Theory 70
The True Course of the History 71
The Choice of Views 73
The Levites in "P" 73
"P" Does Not Reflect Post-Exilic Conditions . . 74
The Priests in "P" 76
Minor Points 76
Firstlings 78
The Slave Laws 79

IV. THE LITERARY ARGUMENT 81
The Bias and Inaccuracy of the Critics . . . 83
The Redactors 84
Strangeness of the Selection of Words . . . 85
Literary Feeling 86
Critical Lack of Judgment 88
The Effect of Glosses on Style 89
Style Not Necessarily a Criterion of Authorship . . 89

V. HIGHER CRITICAL ARGUMENTS AND POSITIONS THAT ARE DUE TO PURELY SUBJECTIVE CAUSES 92
The Ark in Numbers x. 92
Criticism of Dr. Gray's View 93
Dr. Kautzsch's Views 94
Dr. Kuenen's Views 95
Mr. Addis's View 95
The Mental Atmosphere of the Critics 96
Dreams and Angels as Criteria of "Sources" . . . 97
The Doublets 98
The Case of Aram-naharaim 99
Laban's Home in Syria 101
Balaam's Home 101
Another Instance 102
Sympathy with Eastern Ideas Necessary . . . 103
Ignorance of Human Nature 104
Another Subjective Cause 104
What the Critics Believe 105
Critical Disagreement 106

VI. THE SIGNS OF POST-MOSAIC DATE . . . 107

VII. THE MORAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUES . . 110
The Legislation Professedly Mosaic . . . 110
The Decalogue and Deuteronomy 111
The Priestly Code 111

VIII. THE THEORY OF A HEXATEUCH . . . 112

IX. THE CONSTRUCTIVE CASE FOR UNITY . . . 113
Signs of Unity 114
Genesis xxix.—xxxiii. 114
Numbers xvi. 115
The Characters Unitary 116

X. THE EVIDENCE FOR MOSAIC DATE 117
A. Internal Evidence 117
Professor Green on Deuteronomy 117
The Historical Situation Required by "P" . . . 118
The Concentration of the People 119
The Law of Slaughter for Food 120
Other Historical Evidence 121
The Hierarchical Organization 122
Ezra and the Law 123
The Legal Evidence of Mosaic Date . . . 123
The Law of Theft 126
Other Legal Evidence 127
The Evidence of the Narrative 128
B. External Evidence of Date . . 129
Ezekiel and "P" 130
Law and Teaching 131
Hosea's Testimony 131
Evidence of the Existence of Institutions . . . 132

XI. THE EVIDENCE OF PRE-MOSAIC DATE . . . 134
The Evidence of Genesis x. 19 134
The Legal Evidence 135
The Law of Homicide 137
The Father's Power 138
The Archæological Evidence 138
Impossibility of the Critical Explanations . . . 139
The Archæological Confirmation 140

XII. THE TESTIMONY OF TRADITION 141

XIII. CONSTRUCTIVE CONCLUSIONS 143
The Pentateuch a Piece of Statesmanship . . . 144
The Order of the Laws 144
Other Results 145
INDEX I (Texts) 147
INDEX II (Subjects) 150

The Origin of the Pentateuch

I

THE HIGHER CRITICISM

It is well known that in our time a view of the origin of the Pentateuch differing fundamentally from that commonly held by Jews and Christians alike has found extensive acceptance in all quarters of the civilized world. The object of this book is to consider whether this view is tenable in the light of the best modern scholarship and, if it be not, to suggest to what conclusion the evidence at present points.

DIFFICULTIES OF THE PENTATEUCH

That the Pentateuch in its present form contains many grave difficulties has been obvious to students of every age. Evidence of this may be found, for example, in the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Samaritans, as is well known, possess an edition of the Pentateuch which is in most respects substantially identical with the ordinary Jewish text. But (apart from other matters which need not now detain us) it shows changes that have been made for the purpose of reconciling discrepancies in the original. For instance, it is stated in the book of Numbers that Aaron died on Mount Hor (Num. xx. 22–29; xxxiii. 38), but in Deut. x. 6 we find a different account, according to which he died in Moserah, which appears to be the same place as the Moseroth of Num. xxxiii. 30, 31. The Samaritan edition meets this and the other difficulties that arise on a comparison between Deut. x. 6, 7, and Num xxxiii.

by rewriting the passage in Deuteronomy in the light of the data of Numbers, incorporating such additional information as is contained in Deuteronomy.

No textual importance attaches to the Samaritan alteration; but it shows very clearly how strongly the difficulty was felt more than two thousand years ago.

THE STORY OF JOSEPH

Other difficulties are numerous. Thus if we look at the story of Joseph we shall find much that is not easy to understand. When he had been thrown into the pit by his brethren, 'A travelling company of *Ishmaelites* came from Gilead' (Gen. xxxvii. 25). The brothers decided to sell him; and then we read: "and there passed by men, *Midianites,* merchantmen, and they drew and lifted up Joseph out of the pit and sold Joseph to the *Ishmaelites* . . . .And the *Medanites* sold him into Egypt unto Potiphar . . . . and Potiphar . . . . bought him of the hand of the Ishmaelites which had brought him down thither" (Gen. xxxvii. 28, 36; xxxix. 1).

This alternation of the terms "Midianites" ("Medanites") and "Ishmaelites" is certainly perplexing, and it is difficult to understand why those who had already been introduced into the narrative should suddenly be reintroduced as "men, Midianites, merchantmen," as if nothing had been said of them before. It *may* be that "Midianites" and "Ishmaelites" were terms that were sometimes interchangeable, but we must not wonder if there are minds that regard this explanation as insufficient to account for the phenomena of our present text. Then, if we go a little further on, we shall find some more embarrassments awaiting us. As the result of an unjust accusation made by his wife, the captain of the guard, Potiphar, who was Joseph's master, threw him into prison. Where? "And

Joseph's master took him, and put him into the prison, the place where the king's prisoners were bound: and he was there in the prison. But the LORD was with Joseph, and showed kindness unto him, and gave him favor in the sight of *the keeper of the prison.* And *the keeper of the prison* committed to Joseph's hand all the prisoners that were in the prison" (Gen. xxxix. 20–22). That seems clear enough, but the next chapter is in conflict with it. Pharaoh, being angry with his two officers, "put them in ward *in the house of the captain of the guard,* into the prison, the place where Joseph was bound. And the *captain of the guard charged Joseph with them,* and he ministered unto them . . . . And he asked Pharaoh's officers that were with him *in ward in his master's house*" (xl. 2–4, 7). It will be seen that the prison is here located in his master's house, and that Joseph's attendance on prisoners is attributed not to the favor of the keeper of the prison, but to the action of the captain of the guard. No doubt a formal reconciliation is possible, but the text is far from easy.

THE NARRATIVES OF THE TENT OF MEETING

Serious trouble is caused by the narratives of the Tent of Meeting. In Ex. xxxiii. 7–11, before the Ark is made, Moses takes "*the* tent," and pitches it outside the camp, and calls it "the tent of meeting." When he leaves it, Joshua, his servant, is in charge. Now the verbs used are frequentative and point to a regular practice. It is striking that a few chapters earlier detailed instructions had been given to Moses for the erection of the later Tabernacle (Ex. xxv. ff.), which was a far more elaborate structure, situate in the midst of the camp and guarded by priests. The points of conflict between the two representations are many and serious. If in the one we find Joshua an Ephraimite, the ministry of the other is re-

served for priests and Levites: outside the camp is quite a different location from that of the better known Dwelling which stood carefully guarded in the center of a symmetrically formed encampment: the sizes of the two structures and the materials of which they were made are entirely different: and so on. Nor is the difficulty diminished by later passages in Num. xi. and xii., where we read of "going out" to the Tent of Meeting, though it must be conceded that the verb used does not necessarily imply that the tent was elsewhere than in the center of the camp, so that these passages would not in themselves cause trouble if Ex. xxxiii. could be explained satisfactorily.

THE PRIESTHOOD

Closely related to this is a group of problems affecting the priesthood. The Ephraimite Joshua, as we have seen, remains in the Tent of Meeting in one representation, while in another its ministers are Priests and Levites. These two classes are not equal, but are sharply distinguished in the book of Numbers. Deuteronomy, however, has yet a third tale to tell. It practically equates priests and Levites, referring constantly to "the priests the Levites," and it becomes difficult or impossible to trace in its provisions the distinctions of Numbers. This difficulty is accentuated by discrepancies in the laws as to firstlings and other subjects.

OTHER LEGAL DIFFICULTIES

Other enactments that have nothing to do with the priesthood are also pressed into service. It is said that Ex. xxi. and Deut. xv. contain laws giving Hebrew slaves a right to freedom after six years' service, to be followed by perpetual slavery if the slave refuses to avail himself of the right, but Lev. xxv. forbids perpetual slavery, gives a right to freedom in the year

of jubilee, and knows nothing of these provisions of the other books. How can two such entirely different sets of laws proceed from one man? Harmonizing interpretations seeking to show that the law of Exodus applied subject to the jubilee do not meet the difficulty. It is true that a legislator might easily enact that slaves should go free in the jubilee year, and that (subject to that provision) they were to serve for six years, and, if they then refused freedom, until the next jubilee; but that is not the case here. The two laws are not brought into relation with each other as they should be if the lawgiver intended that both institutions should apply to the same persons.

OTHER DIFFICULTIES

Again, it has been noticed that there are a large number of narratives relating to similar incidents. "Twice do quails appear in connection wth the daily manna (Num. xi. 4–6, 31 ff. and Ex. xvi. 13). Twice does Moses draw water from the rock, when the strife of Israel begets the name Meribah (strife) (Ex. xvii. 1–7 and Num. xx. 1–13)."[1] Such doublets, as they are called, are used as a further argument against the traditional view; and they are supported by other phenomena presented by the laws. Here too we meet with frequent repetitions. Thus the calendar of festivals occurs no fewer than four times in various forms. These facts require explanation, as do also the perplexing order and arrangement of the laws. The sequence of the various rules and the general grouping of the whole legislation into widely separate bodies are certainly not intelligible at first sight. Few readers of the Bible could give a satisfactory account of the order and arrangement of the legislation of the Pentateuch. Then again the narrative is frequently disjointed. Here it is sometimes quite impossible to understand the sequence of events or the

[1] **J. Estlin Carpenter, Oxford Hexateuch, vol. i. p. 30.**

reasons for the order adopted. The principles are certainly not similar to those followed in any other book, sacred or profane, and in many cases the reader can form no clear conception of the events narrated.

ASTRUC AND THE DOCUMENTARY THEORY

It has been sought to meet these difficulties by resolving the Pentateuch into a number of documents. Instead of regarding it as a work of Moses, the widely prevalent documentary theory sees in it a compilation from a number of post-Mosaic documents. Astruc, the father of this view, was a writer who believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He thought that Moses must have composed the book of Genesis from older sources, and he suggested a clue which has been adopted by nearly all succeeding critics. Ex. vi. 3 runs: "And I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, as God Almighty; but by my name JHVH I was not known to them." This Name is called the Tetragrammaton, from its possessing four letters. In the ordinary English Bibles it is almost always rendered "the LORD" — the small capitals being used to show that the Name here occurs in the Hebrew text, and that the English is not a rendering of the ordinary word for Lord. In this the English Bible merely follows later Jewish usage, which avoided the Name of God from a feeling of reverence. This practice has obscured the facts for many English readers who do not always realize that there are a number of passages in Genesis which are inconsistent with Ex. vi. If the Name was not known before the time of Moses, it is hard to see how men could have begun to call upon it in the days of Enosh (Gen. iv. 26), or how Abram could have used it in Gen. xv. 2, where the "GOD" of the Authorized Version represents the Tetragrammaton. Yet side by side with the pas-

sages where the Tetragrammaton is used we find other passages in which the Deity is designated by the word *Elohim*, God. Accordingly Astruc proposed the appellations of the Deity in the book of Genesis as affording a clue to earlier sources and suggested a division. This suggestion has been taken up by many subsequent writers, but with an important difference. While Astruc believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, his successors discarded that view, and sought to divide the whole work into continuous post-Mosaic documents. Indeed, at the present day most critics go further and speak not of a Pentateuch, but of a Hexateuch (consisting of the first six books of the Bible), as having been composed from such sources. After Ex. vi. 3, the clue afforded by the Divine appellations naturally fails, but it is claimed that this clue has led the way to the detection of other clues which continue after the revelation of the Tetragrammaton. Perhaps some examples of the method will be the best explanation.

THE CRITICAL METHOD EXEMPLIFIED

Throughout the first chapter of Genesis and the first three verses of the second we find the Deity referred to as *Elohim*, i.e. God. Hence this passage will be assigned to a document that does not use the Tetragrammaton in Genesis. This supposed source is now generally called P, i.e. the Priestly writing, but was earlier known as the Elohist, and then, when a second Elohist was distinguished, as the first Elohist. It will uniformly be called P in the present discussion. But in the middle of ii. 4 we find a change. Instead of reading "God," we suddenly come upon "LORD GOD," and accordingly a writer J is here postulated, who used the Tetragrammaton from the beginning of his narrative. If, now, we compare i. 1–ii. 3

with ii. 4b[1] ff., we shall find that there are other differences besides those of the Divine appellations. For example, in i. 1 God *creates* the heavens and the earth, but in ii. 4b he *makes* the earth and the heavens. That is a difference of vocabulary, and, once it has been established, it fixes the *provenance* of ii. 4a: "these are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were *created,*" which accordingly goes to P, the writer who used the word "created," leaving J to commence in the middle of the verse. Other differences of vocabulary are immediately detected, and side by side with these we find differences of representation. It is claimed that in ii. 4b ff. the conception is far more anthropomorphic than in P, since God here *forms* man, and *breathes* into his nostrils the breath of life, etc., and that the creative acts are here regarded as having been performed in a different sequence from that narrated in the first chapter. Once this method is regarded as correct and infallible, it becomes easy to extend it. If we consider "These are the generations of" as being a phrase characterizing one source to the exclusion of all others, if follows that whenever we come across this phrase we shall detect the presence of that source. Hence we shall not only find P in several passages in Genesis; but when we come to Num. iii. 1 and read "and these are the generations of Aaron and Moses in that day that," etc., we shall recognize his hand.

THE CURRENT DOCUMENTARY THEORY

These few slight examples may suffice to indicate the method. Combining the data afforded by all the various classes of phenomena to which reference has been made, the

[1] In references to Biblical verses the first and second halves are where necessary distinguished by the letters a and b respectively.

critics propound a documentary theory which, in the form most widely accepted, is, briefly, as follows:

In the time of the monarchy there were current two main histories, one of which used the Tetragrammaton from the beginning and is therefore called J, while the second used *Elohim* either invariably or at any rate habitually before Ex. iii., and is therefore called E. These documents were very much alike in general style. Indeed, save for the criterion afforded by the Divine appellations and the striking differences in the story of Joseph, it is usually impossible to distinguish them. Yet some few characteristics are noticed. Thus it is said that E has a fondness for angels and dreams; that, of two words for "maid-servant," one (*shifchah*) is preferred by J, and the other, (*amah*) by E, and so on. These two narratives were combined into a composite work JE, and passages are often assigned to JE when there is no ground for assigning them specifically to J or E. In the course of combination a few changes were made by an editor or redactor who sometimes inserted phrases and sometimes even rewrote a passage on the basis of the earlier documents. Later the bulk of Deuteronomy was written — probably in the reign of Josiah — by a person or school who used JE. This work is denoted by the symbol D. It was combined with JE into a total JED by another redactor, who added Deuteronomic touches to JE. The groundwork of the first four books, however, does not come from any of these documents, but from a writing that was composed by priests in the priestly interest. This is distinguished by the letter P, and it is from this source that the majestic opening of our Bible is taken. The priestly writing is not itself a unity. On the contrary it certainly contains portions of an earlier code from which most of Lev. xvii.–xxvi. is derived. This is called the Law of Holiness,

and is distinguished by the symbol H or P^{h}. It is earlier than P, but its date cannot be certainly fixed. The main priestly writing itself is younger than Ezekiel, and was composed in or after the Babylonian exile. It was combined with JED by a redactor writing in the priestly spirit, who occasionally glossed or modified the earlier documents.

Such in outline is the theory. The finer shadings have been omitted for the sake of simplicity, for some of the distinctions would only bewilder, without in any way assisting the reader in the present inquiry. What has been said, sufficiently indicates the general nature of the analysis and of the grounds on which it rests.

THE DEVELOPMENT HYPOTHESIS

We must, however, glance at the general theory of historical development with which this analysis is now connected. A series of leading critics have propounded a hypothesis of development which, from the name of its two chief exponents, has been called the Graf-Wellhausen theory. According to this, we are to regard the documents as representing successive stages of development. The first two (JE) permit sacrifice anywhere on an altar of earth or stone; and the practice of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, Saul, and others conforms to this. Then comes Deuteronomy, with an urgent demand for the centralization of all sacrificial worship "at the place which the LORD shall choose" (i.e. Jerusalem). Lastly, P can conceive no other state of affairs than that demanded by Deuteronomy; and, following on lines first suggested by Ezekiel, introduces a division of priests and Levites and a hierarchical organization that were unknown alike to the earlier documents and to preëxilic history.

With many modern students this theory is almost axiomatic. In their minds it is supported by a sort of compound of the

stylistic arguments, the discrepancies, the indications of post-Mosaic data, the repetitions, and the legal and historical hypotheses. Perhaps the portion of the theory to which most modern critics assign the greatest weight is not the oldest but the newest part. The historical reconstruction is probably regarded by many modern writers as, if anything, *more* firmly established than the underlying analysis, which in its main elements is much older. In any case it can be shown that when better methods of research are employed the theory breaks down at every point, and the succeeding divisions will be devoted to outlining those methods and their application, together with the view of the authorship of the Pentateuch that arises from the ruins of the documentary and evolutionary theories.

II

THE ANSWER OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

In the examination of these theories it is necessary to take up many different lines of argument, and it will be convenient to begin with the evidence of textual criticism. Every one is familiar in his own experience with the errors that arise in copying. A word is accidentally left out or written a second time: some letters of the original are illegible: a passage is omitted through the copyist's eye being caught by a second occurrence of a phrase that he has just written, with the result that he does not notice the intervening words. Such errors inevitably arise in every text that depends on a MS. tradition. To deal with them, the science of textual criticism has come into existence. It consists of the application of common sense and the teachings of experience to textual phenomena: and its application to all other MS. texts, sacred or secular, is universally admitted. In the case of the Pentateuch there are few students of any kind who would absolutely repudiate it.

THE MATERIALS FOR THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH

What, then, are the materials for the textual criticism of the Pentateuch? There is, first, the received Hebrew text of the day, with such variants as are embodied in its marginal notes or in MSS. that may differ from it. This text is called the Massoretic text, from a word *Massorah,* meaning "tradition." We have no positive information as to the date of its formation or the persons who formed it; but we do know

that it is many centuries — in some cases perhaps nearly two thousand years — subsequent to the original autographs of the Bible. It is therefore not merely possible, but even probable, that it differs from them in many respects. That this is in fact the case can be seen at a glance by anybody who cares to compare those passages of which we have two copies in the Hebrew Bible itself, the duplicate Psalms or the parallels between Chronicles and the earlier historical books. Half an hour with such a book as Canon Girdlestone's "Deuterographs"[1] will suffice to convince the English reader who is no Hebraist that there are numerous divergences, and that he must be prepared to apply to the text of the Old Testament those canons which have long since been used in reference to the New Testament and secular writings.

THE SEPTUAGINT

Side by side with the Massoretic text we have a number of other recensions of the text which have been preserved to us in ancient Versions. Of these the first Greek version, known as the Septuagint, is the most important. This was a Jewish translation made for the use of the Jews of Alexandria before the Christian era. It is still the Old Testament of certain sections of the Christian church. In the case of the Pentateuch, comparison with the extant Hebrew shows that it was a very literal word-for-word translation; but frequently we come to variations of one kind or another. On retranslating these into Hebrew, we may find that they give a better or a worse text, and we may be able to see clearly how the difference arose. Perhaps this may best be clear by a few instances. In Gen. xxii. 14 we read "in the mount of the LORD." The Septuagint, however, has "in the mount the LORD." On retrans-

[1] Frowde 1894.

lating into Hebrew, we find that the consonants are the same, but the vowels are different. In ancient Hebrew the vowels were not written at all. Therefore the Septuagint here does not testify to a different text: it merely testifies to a different way of reading the same text, whether better or worse we shall see at a later stage. This then is one form of variant. There are others.

THE DISCREPANCY IN EXODUS XVIII. 5 FF.

In Ex. xviii. we read how Jethro came to visit Moses. The Hebrew text contains a great difficulty. In verse 6 we read of his saying to Moses, "I thy father-in-law Jethro am come." Yet in verse 7 Moses goes out to meet his father-in-law, they exchange greetings, and subsequently come into the tent. It is by no means clear how Jethro could have spoken to Moses *before* they met. Accordingly the critics suppose that we have here different documents. One represented Jethro as coming to Moses in the camp: the other told of Moses going out to meet his father-in-law and bringing him to the camp. Not so the Septuagint. When its rendering is retranslated into Hebrew, we get a text that gives us "And one [or, according to another possible pronunciation, "they"] said unto Moses, Behold, thy father-in-law Jethro is come," etc. The only difference here, when allowance is made for known variations in orthography, consists of the corruption of a single letter, giving us "Behold" for "I." In this instance the Septuagint is supported by the old Syriac version and a copy of the Samaritan, which is not a version at all but a Hebrew text of the Pentateuch. Now, whatever view we may ultimately take, one thing is certain. *Some* explanation must be found for this alternative reading. If the critical theory at this point be correct, what we must believe is this: There were two different

stories. For some reason that is not very clear, an editor chose to compile a third story from them, and he did so in a way that made nonsense. Textual corruption next set in, but it was of so felicitous a character that by the alteration of a single letter it turned the editor's nonsense into the most perfect sense, so that no reader of the corrupt text could possibly detect any joint or guess that he had before him a corrupted cento of documents. This corruption was so wide-spread that it affected our three earliest witnesses to the text — the LXX,[1] the Syriac, and the Samaritan — but fortunately it is absent from the later Hebrew tradition. Is it not simpler to suppose that the LXX and its supporters are here correct, and that the whole difficulty has arisen through the accidental corruption of a letter in the later transmission of the Hebrew text?

THE LEGITIMACY OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

At this point it will be well to reassure those who may find this method doubtful or suspicious. There is a textual criticism that consists of wild and reckless conjectures. Needless to say, nothing of that kind is here advocated. But it is the fact that at different times various texts have been regarded as of especial authority. The Ancient Versions mostly had a more or less official character. They were the products of the best scholarship and the most intense religion of their own day, and they are therefore not to be regarded as antagonistic to faith. If a reading was good enough to be accepted by Jerome and embodied in the Vulgate, it is difficult to see how its acceptance could possibly harm Christianity. If a text was regarded as correct by the Septuagint or by one of the Aramaic renderings (called Targums) which were prepared for official use in the Synagogue, it seems impossible to

[1] LXX stands for Septuagint.

imagine that it could be destructive of Judaism. The best and most learned men some fifteen or twenty centuries ago were just as pious as any of their modern successors, and assuredly their Bibles cannot injure our faith. Hence there is no ground for unreasoning alarm at any use that may be made of the Ancient Versions. In this connection the following passage from the preface to the Revised Version of the Old Testament may be quoted:

"The Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament Scriptures has come down to us in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension. That other recensions were at one time in existence is probable from the variations in the Ancient Versions, the oldest of which, namely the Greek or Septuagint, was made, at least in part, some two centuries before the Christian era. But as the state of knowledge on the subject is not at present such as to justify any attempt at an entire reconstruction of the text on the authority of the Versions, the Revisers have thought it most prudent to adopt the Massoretic Text as the basis of their work, and to depart from it, as the Authorized Translators had done, only in exceptional cases."

This conservative attitude was the only one possible for the revisers — especially as they combined with it this word of caution as to the existence of recensions other than the Massoretic. But, for the purpose of discussing the composition of the Pentateuch on internal grounds, this attitude cannot be maintained. If the author in fact wrote "Behold, thy father-in-law Jethro is come," then it is the height of futility to argue that we are face to face with a patchwork on the ground that the Massoretic text reads "I thy father-in-law," etc. We

must first use all the available knowledge and ascertain if possible what the author did write, and then, and only then, can we begin to suspect authenticity and tradition on internal grounds.

THE NEED FOR CAUTION

And here it is right to utter a word of warning. It does not by any means follow that because in some cases the Ancient Versions have preserved better readings, therefore their readings must in all cases be superior. The Versions may themselves have undergone textual corruption: or in a given passage a particular rendering may represent an explanation rather than a translation: or, finally, the Hebrew text that lay before the translators may have been intrinsically inferior in parts to our present Hebrew text. A scientific textual criticism naturally weighs all these considerations carefully. It seeks to ascertain the original text of the translation: then it tries to find out what Hebrew the translator had before him, and lastly it balances the respective merits of the various Hebrew readings. Speaking generally, it may be said that every text preserves *some* readings of value. A text that is generally inferior to the other authorities may in one or more passages have preserved a tradition which has escaped some corruption otherwise generally current.

OTHER GREEK VERSIONS

The Septuagint is not the only ancient Version. There were other Greek Versions, those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion being the best known. These have not been preserved to us, but notes of their readings in particular passages are extant, and often contain extremely valuable information. Aquila in particular is a singularly conscientious guide. There is a theory that he was a disciple of Rabbi Akiba's.

This rabbi was remarkable for the great weight he assigned to every particle of the text, and this characteristic is reflected in Aquila's translation. The rendering is marked by an almost incredible defiance of Greek grammar in the interests of absolute literalness, and consequently it is usually possible to feel the utmost certainty as to the Hebrew text followed by this translator.

THE "PRIESTS" OF EXODUS XIX

An interesting and important instance of the value that sometimes attaches to Aquila's readings is to be found in Ex. xix. In verses 22 and 24 we meet with "priests." The events recorded took place before the institution of the priesthood of Aaron, and accordingly there has always been difficulty about the passage. The old view was that before the institution of the priesthood the first-born acted as priests: but they bear this title nowhere else, and the hypothesis is not in the least probable. The critics argue for the documentary theory. 'Here,' they say, 'is a document that knows of priests. No priesthood has yet been instituted, therefore this is a different document from those that tell of the priesthood of Aaron and his sons, and it embodies a different view of the early history.' Recently, however, a note of Aquila's has been published showing that in verse 22, he read "elders," not "priests." Of his reading in verse 24 no record has been preserved: but it is reasonable to suppose that he had the same word in both verses. In Hebrew this word "elders" differs from "priests" by only two letters. So it is easy to see that one text or the other is due to a slight corruption. If we read the chapter with a view to ascertaining which of the two readings fits the context, we find that in the earlier portion the elders had been prominent and that a mention of them is required here. Ac-

cordingly it becomes evident that the unintelligible "priests" is not due to a difference of source or to the existence of an otherwise unmentioned sacerdotal class, but to an error of two letters.

AQUILA AND THE TETRAGRAMMATON

Before leaving Aquila, one other feature of his translation must be mentioned. His extreme conscientiousness led him never to render the Tetragrammaton, but simply to transcribe it, and that in the old Hebrew characters. This gives his testimony on this point peculiar importance, for the application of such a principle makes it certain that no desire to paraphrase could have led him to alter the usage of the Hebrew text he followed.

OTHER VERSIONS

Other translations of importance are the Syriac, the Vulgate, and the Aramaic paraphrases called Targums. The Samaritan Pentateuch is a recension of the Hebrew text that occasionally preserves valuable readings, but it cannot compare with the Septuagint or the Vulgate as an authority for the correction of the Massoretic text.

ASTRUC'S CLUE TESTED

Other remarks about textual criticism will fall to be made later. For the present it is desirable to test the worth of Astruc's clue and the documentary theory based on it. While the evidence of textual criticism supplies the most important material for checking the soundness of that clue, it does not provide the only material, and it will be convenient to consider other relevant facts at the same time without concentrating on the textual evidence to the exclusion of everything else. The following extract from the writer's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" gives tests that are based solely on the

Massoretic Hebrew — without reference to the data of the Versions or the Samaritan.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF EFFECTING A CLEAN DIVISION

"1. It is not, in fact, possible to divide the early portions of the Pentateuch into three main sources (P, E, and J), each of which shall be self-consistent in the use of the designations of God and shall also conform to a uniform practice.

"(1) As to P: The Tetragrammaton occurs in two passages of P (Gen. xvii. 1 and xxi. 1b). In both cases a redactor or copyist has to be invoked to get rid of it.

"(2) As to E: The Tetragrammaton occurs in four passages of E (Gen. xv. 1, 2; xxii. 11; xxvii. 7b). In all these cases recourse is had as usual to a redactor.

"(3) As to J: There are here two separate lines of argument.

"(*a*) The discrepancy as to the use of the Tetragrammaton which the critical theory was designed to remove reappears, though on a smaller scale. J uses the Tetragrammaton before (according to J) it was known. His statement is that after the birth of Enosh men began to call upon the name of the LORD (Gen. iv. 26). Yet not only does the Tetragrammaton occur very freely in the narrative of the preceding chapters, but it is actually put into the mouth of Eve, the grandmother of Enosh, long before Seth, his father, had been born. She is made to say, 'I have gotten a man with the LORD' (iv. 1). How is this possible on the critical theory? Why is it conceivable that the author of J could do that which, *ex hypothesi,* the author of the Pentateuch could not?

"(*b*) . . . . J uses *Elohim* in many passages, and only a few of these have been noted by Mr. Carpenter. We have

observed the following: Gen. iii. 1, 3, 5; iv. 25 (contrast iv. 1); vii. 9; ix. 27; xxvi. 24 (in a Divine revelation where the Name ought most certainly to appear on the critical theory); xxxii. 29 (28); xxxiii. 5, 10, 11; xxxix. 9; xliii. 23, 29; xliv. 16; xlv. 9; xlviii. 15 (twice); l. 24. We have seen that in some instances Mr. Carpenter is reduced to postulating redactors, in others he invents brainspun subtleties to account for the word, while his silence in yet others indicates that he has not considered the phenomena they present."

THE REDACTOR'S CONDUCT

"2. An even more serious objection is to be found in the divisions which the critics are compelled to effect in order to carry through their theory. It is one thing to suggest that a continuous passage like Gen. i. 1–ii. 3, or xi. 1–9, or xiv. may be ultimately derived from a separate source; it is quite another to postulate such proceedings as are attributed to the redactors of the critical case. The following instances are limited to those in which the appellations of the Deity are the sole or determining criterion: in xvi. the use of the Tetragrammaton in verse 2 compels Mr. Carpenter to wrench 1b and 2 from a P context and assign them to J; in xix., verse 29 is torn from a J chapter in which it fits perfectly, to be given to P; in xx. the last verse is assigned to a redactor, though all the rest of the chapter goes to E, and the verse is required for the explanation of 17; in xxii., verses 14–18 go to redactors because the story is assigned to E (a redactor being responsible for the Tetragrammaton in 11). An even more flagrant instance occurs in xxviii. 21, where Mr. Carpenter is compelled to scoop out the words 'and the LORD will be my God' and assign them to J, the beginning and end of the verse going to E. What manner of man was this re-

dactor who constructed a narrative on these strange principles? In xxxi., verse 3 has to go to a redactor because the preceding and subsequent verses belong to E: yet that gentleman actually postulates the redactor's work by referring to the statement of 3 in verse 5. However, he receives compensation in xxxii., where verse 30 is wrenched from a J context for his enrichment, though verse 31 (J) cannot be understood without it.

"During the later chapters there are no instances, because the Tetragrammaton occurs in Genesis only once after xxxix. 23, so that 'a peculiar revision' has to be postulated to justify the analysis during the remainder of the book. It must be remembered further that we have confined ourselves to flagrant cases where the Divine appellations are the sole or determining criterion: there are others where it is one of the criteria (e.g. the assignment of v. 29, the division of the flood story)."[1]

THE TEXTUAL OBJECTION

These lines of argument were followed by a third — that supplied by the textual evidence as to the occurrences of the Divine appellations in the book of Genesis. The discussion was too detailed and elaborate to be transcribed here. For the present purpose the following extract from an article in the *Churchman*[2] for April, 1909, will be sufficient. Nevertheless, the point is of so much importance that many readers may desire to see the fuller proof, and in that case they are referred to Chapter I. of "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism."

"Yet, had the critics investigated the textual material, they would have found that Hebrew manuscripts, the Samaritan

[1] Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, pp. 7–9.

[2] In all cases the references to the *Churchman* are to the London magazine of that name published by Elliot Stock.

Pentateuch, and the ancient Versions frequently differ from the received Hebrew text. Among Septuagintal scholars an attempt has been made to minimize the force of this, so far as the ancient Greek Version is concerned, by supposing that the Alexandrian translators often wrote 'God' to avoid the Tetragrammaton in their Hebrew original. This would have been rather pointless, having regard to the fact that they did not transliterate the Name itself, but substituted κύριος ('Lord'); but it is not necessary to rely on this consideration to vindicate the Greek text, because extant Hebrew variants frequently confirm the Septuagintal authorities. So do the other Versions, including even Aquila the orthodox. The testimony of this translator is peculiarly valuable, for two different reasons: first, no mistake is possible in his case, since he refused to translate the Tetragrammaton at all, but wrote the Name in the old Hebrew characters; secondly, he was in close touch with authoritative Jewish exegesis, so that a reading of his represents the best Jewish text of the day.

"Now, in most cases where there are variants no certain inference can be drawn as to the original reading. Either word would fit the context as well as the other, just as in a history of our own times it would frequently be possible to use 'the King,' or 'Edward VII,' or 'King Edward' indifferently; but there are other cases where we have means of judging between the two readings on their merits, and here it sometimes happens that we can, for one reason or another, prove the received Hebrew text to be wrong. For example, in Gen. xvi. 11 the explanation of the name of Ishma*el,* 'because the LORD hath heard,' cannot be right, for the explanation demands the name Ishma*yah,* not Ishma*el.* But one Hebrew manuscript, the Lucianic recension of the LXX, and

the old Latin read 'God.' 'Ishma*el*' is, then, parallel to Isra*el* and Peni*el*, and we see that in this instance the received text has the inferior reading, and that for some reason or other the Tetragrammaton has ousted the word *elohim*."

SOME ILLUSTRATIONS

"It will be well to give a few examples of the way in which these variants affect the documentary theory. Thus, in Gen. ii. 4b, 5, 7, 8, it is known that the original LXX had 'God' only, and that Origin in each case added 'LORD' to bring it into accord with the Hebrew text of his day. A glance at any higher critical discussion of 'J's' 'Creation story' will reveal the revolutionary nature of these facts. Again, in iv. 1 (J) the LXX and other ancient authorities read 'God' for 'LORD,' and in view of iv. 26 it cannot be doubted that this is correct. In the Flood story, the original text with regard to the Divine appellations is quite uncertain. In xix. 29 (P) the best Septuagintal text is: 'And it came to pass, when the LORD destroyed all the cities of the plain, God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when the LORD destroyed,' etc. In xx. 4 (E) fourteen Hebrew manuscripts have the Tetragrammaton for the Hebrew 'LORD.' In xxi. 2b (P) the LXX has 'LORD' as also in 6 (E). It would be possible to multiply instances almost indefinitely, but these are sufficient to illustrate my point. The textual authorities continually introduce the Tetragrammaton into P and E."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ARGUMENT

"It is thus singularly easy to prove that the present documentary theory cannot be supported, and I doubt whether any higher critic could be found to undertake the defence of the Massoretic text in this matter. But it would still be pos-

sible to suggest that *a* documentary theory based on Ex. vi. 3 was correct, and that if we had the original text of Genesis it would be feasible to carry out a division on this basis, though it might not coincide in all cases with the present critical division. I have even known an eminent critic to take this view in private correspondence. Before disposing of it, I wish to point out what is involved in even so apparently slight a concession to the evidence of facts. The critics have throughout acted on the assumption that the Hebrew text was entirely trustworthy in this matter. If the division is wrong, the whole of their linguistic case as hitherto formulated falls with it. The lists of words, the lexicography extraordinary, in some cases even the linguistic history, depend primarily on this division. Probably the same would be true of their history of religion, but nothing definite could be said about this unless they were prepared to put forward a revised division showing what changes they thought necessary in the light of these facts." [1]

THE DISCUSSION IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

The writer's treatment of this question first appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1909. It led to a discussion in the *Expository Times* which made the weakness of the critical position sun-clear. The Rev. A. P. Cox sent a note to the May number, asking for a reference to "a book or article in which these matters are dealt with from the standpoint of those who accept the critical division based on Ex. vi. 3." Principal Skinner attempted to negotiate the question in the same number. He was unable to refer to any work which treated of the point, and sought to deal with the matter as best he could. Unfortunately he had no sufficient

[1] The Churchman, April, 1909, pp. 282–284.

acquaintance with the facts and had clearly not read the article he was endeavoring to answer. This placed him at an undeniable though self-imposed disadvantage. But it did not prevent him from making a number of statements which he subsequently failed to support in cross-examination or from depreciating the *Bibliotheca Sacra* article, which he obviously had not read. Thus he asserted that the LXX differed from the Massoretic text in Genesis in forty-nine instances, suggested that this might be largely due to the errors of Greek scribes, and so on. The present writer replied in the July number of the *Expository Times*. In transcribing the material portions of that reply, page references to "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" are inserted in addition to the original references to the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1909.

"In Gen. xvi. 11 an explanation of the name Ishmael is given in which the Tetragrammaton is used. But the Lucianic LXX, the Old Latin and one *Hebrew* MS. read *Elohim*.

"1. Dr. Skinner says it is reasonable to expect that Jewish scribes would be more careful in this matter than Greek copyists. But this instance shows that the variant is a *Hebrew* variant, for the mistakes of *Greek* copyists could not possibly influence a Hebrew MS. I therefore submit that little reliance can be placed on this argument. For numerous other examples, see [Essays, pp. 14–15, 36 f. = Bibliotheca Sacra,] pp. 128–130, 150 ff.; and for a further body of evidence drawn from the support of other Versions, see [Essays, pp. 15 f. = Bib. Sac.] pp. 130 f. Once the fact that the Greek rests on Hebrew variants has been established in a number of cases, a presumption arises that it does so in other cases where no independent testimony is preserved; and a case is made for further investigation.

"2. Dr. Skinner further thinks that significance attaches to the fact that in a great majority of instances the LXX substitutes God for the Tetragrammaton of M. T.[1] To this there seem to be two answers: (1) If we regard the Tetragrammaton as original in all cases of difference, this canon must make us suspect M. T. wherever any Version substitutes it for *Elohim* or some other word, and I admit that in all such cases a question does arise. But in Genesis this, of course, means that the Tetragrammaton will have to be introduced into numerous passages of 'E' and 'P.' (2) In some cases where there are differences the *Elohim* of the Versions is demonstrably preferable to the Tetragrammaton of M. T. I instance Gen. xvi. 11 where the name Ishma*el* requires *Elohim* in the explanation (cp. Israel, Peniel). The Tetragrammaton would require Ishma*yah* as the name. Here, again, other instances will be found in [Essays, pp. 16 ff. = Bib. Sac.] pp. 131 ff. Consequently we cannot hold that the variants are all due to a desire to avoid the Name of God. It would rather seem that some readings are due to a tendency of M. T. to substitute the Tetragrammaton for *Elohim*.

"3. Dr. Skinner says that the LXX differs from M. T. in forty-nine cases. But in an enormous number of passages *some* Septuagintal authority, *e.g.* Lucian in Gen. xvi. 11, — sometimes only a single cursive differs from the ordinary LXX reading. By comparing extant Hebrew variants which confirm some of the Septuagintal variants, I have shown ([Essays, p. 36 f. = Bib. Sac.] p. 150 f.) that importance attaches to these. Has Dr. Skinner included all such cases in his forty-nine?

"4. It used to be thought that the M. T. usage as to the

[1] M. T. stands for Massoretic Text.

Divine appellations furnished a criterion for the analysis of Genesis. Dr. Skinner describes the point as one 'of considerable, though not of vital importance in its bearing on the criticism of the Hexateuch,' though he also says that it is now 'but one element (and in the opinion of many critics a very subordinate element) in the analysis of the Hexateuch.' Now I think that by throwing various points into question form I can focus attention on essentials. I accordingly ask your readers to put to themselves the following questions:—

"(*a*) Given the fact (proved in the passages of my article cited in 1, 2, and 3 above) that the Massoretic Text is manifestly insecure in an enormous number of places, and demonstrably wrong in at any rate some of these, is it possible to maintain that on the basis of that text Genesis should be divided (mainly) into three sources, one of which uses the Tetragrammaton, while the other two do not?

"(*b*) Should redactors and glossators be postulated to help out that analysis by removing the Tetragrammaton from passages of 'E' and 'P,' or *Elohim* from passages of 'J' ([Essays, p. 7 f. = Bib. Sac.] p. 122 f.)?

"(*c*) Should divisions into sources ever be made on this basis only ([Essays, p. 8 f. = Bib. Sac.] p. 123 f.)?

"(*d*) Should 'J' be subdivided into a 'Je' and a 'Jj' on such a basis?

"(*e*) Should the current analysis be maintained in cases where it rests on very little more than the Tetragrammaton? For instance, the bulk of Gen. xx. is assigned to 'E.' But in verse 4 fourteen Hebrew MSS. have the Tetragrammaton which is here obviously appropriate. The analysis is supported by the statement that of the two terms for 'maid-servant' the 'E' word is used (ver. 17). But the 'J' word

also occurs (ver. 14), and is assigned to a redactor. Should such a piece of analysis be maintained?

"(*f*) As already stated Dr. Skinner says that the clue is now 'in the opinion of many critics a very subordinate element in the analysis.' Is it possible to refer me to the expression of such an opinion in the published writings of Wellhausen, or Kuenen, or Dr. Driver, or in Gunkel's *Genesis,* or any other authoritative edition of Genesis by a member of the Graf-Wellhausen school?

"5. Dr. Skinner's extreme modesty is responsible for my next point. He writes: 'I do not happen to know of any work which deals exhaustively with the subject from the critical standpoint.' Then he proceeds to indicate generally what he 'imagines to be the view taken by adherents of the prevalent documentary hypothesis.' It must not be inferred that Dr. Skinner is a writer who has no resources save those of his imagination. On the contrary, he is one of the foremost exponents of the hypothesis in question, and when he says that he does not 'happen to know' any work, we may safely conclude that there is no such work. That is to say, although this particular clue has been used for a century and a half, those who used it have not considered whether or not it is textually sound. It is surely remarkable that by adopting Septuagintal readings in three or perhaps four passages the clue disappears altogether ([Essays, pp. 44–56 = Bib. Sac.] pp. 158–170), for it does not exist in the Greek Bible. And in the test passage Ex. vi. 3, the LXX is supported by the Syriac, Vulgate, Onkelos, and a Karaite MS. Do not these facts deserve consideration?"[1]

[1] **The Expository Times, July, 1909, pp. 473–475.**

PROFESSOR SCHLÖGL'S CONTRIBUTION

To this no reply was made. Dr. Skinner's statements were in fact incapable of being substantiated, but a couple of months later (September, 1909) Professor Schlögl took up the debate with a note in which he set out the results of studies in the Old Testament seminar at Vienna as to the occurrences of the Divine appellations from Gen. i. 1 to Ex. iii. 12. His results are as follows:

The Tetragrammaton *alone* occurs 148 times in the Massoretic text of Gen. iv. 1–Ex. iii. 7 inclusive. In 118 places other texts have either God or LORD God. *Elohim alone* occurs 179 times in the Massoretic text of Gen. i. 1–Ex. iii. 12. In 59 passages other texts have LORD (in 47 cases LORD *Elohim*); but those texts which have *Elohim* instead of the Tetragrammaton are in Professor Schlögl's opinion less important. Both words occur together in the M. T. of Gen. ii. 4 to iii. 23 twenty times; but there is only one passage (iii. 1) in which all the texts are unanimous on the point. After some further discussion the professor concludes that "it is consequently quite unscientific to determine the analysis of a source by the names of God." Nothing further was heard from Dr. Skinner, nor was any defense forthcoming of the statement that the LXX differs from the Massoretic text in only forty-nine instances. Owing to the supreme importance of this point and to the conviction with which Astruc's disciples adhere to the clue, it has been thought desirable to follow the *Expository Times* discussion at some length.

DR. SKINNER'S "GENESIS"

It is unhappily necessary to add that Dr. Skinner has since published a commentary on Genesis in which he substantially repeats what he said in the *Expository Times* without taking

cognizance of the facts and arguments urged by Professor Schlögl and the present writer. Thus he takes no notice whatever of the Hebrew variants or of Professor Schlögl's figures, and proceeds on the assumption that there are not more than 49 or 50 varients in Genesis and repeats the argument about the probabilities of error in Greek texts. As his preface is dated as late as April, 1910, the discussion raises issues that are too grave to be considered here, but a full reply will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1910.

PROFESSOR TOY'S ADMISSIONS

On the other hand it is gratifying to be able to note that one of the most prominent American critics has frankly abandoned the celebrated clue. In the *Christian Register* for April 28, 1910, Professor C. H. Toy, after stating the present writers contention adds the following significant remarks: "While the point calls for a more thorough examination than has yet been given it, the conclusion just stated is not out of keeping with the tone of modern criticism. As is well known, critics generally hold that our Hebrew text has suffered greatly from scribes and editors in the process of transmission. It is agreed that divine names have been changed in Chronicles, Psalms, and elsewhere, why not in the Pentateuch?"

OTHER TESTS OF THE CLUE

It may be added that in Ex. vi. 3 the most important Versions supported by a tenth-century Hebrew MS. preserve a reading that differs from that of the Massoretic text by a single letter, and alters the statement from a denial of the *knowledge* of the Tetragrammaton to a denial of its *revelation*. According to this text, God says of his Name that he did not make it known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It will be seen hereafter that this makes a considerable differ-

ence to the sense. Other tests of the theory are supplied by evidence of the pre-Mosaic date of certain portions of Genesis and by the intrinsic impossibility of the analysis, even when not based on the appellations of the Deity. It will be necessary to consider these points hereafter, and therefore this reference must suffice for the present. Yet the following summary may be quoted:

"To sum up: the famous clue provided by Ex. vi. 3 leading to the division of the earlier portions of the Pentateuch into three self-consistent documents, J, E, and P, of which J uses the Tetragrammaton while E and P do not, breaks down for five different reasons: First, no such division can in fact be effected. Secondly, in so far as it is effected, it postulates a series of redactors whose alleged proceedings are unintelligible and inconceivable. Thirdly, in an enormous proportion of cases no reliance can be placed on the readings of the Massoretic text with regard to the Divine appellations. Fourthly, the reading adopted by the higher critics in Ex. vi. 3 is almost certainly wrong. Fifthly, the documentary theory founded on this 'clue' does not account for the frequent traces of pre-Mosaic date, and postulates the most ludicrous divisions even where nothing turns on the appellations of the Deity."[1]

THE ATTITUDE OF THE HIGHER CRITICS

It has been necessary to go into this question at considerable length because of its great importance. The destruction of the critical case on this matter means that for a century and a half the critics have been following a false clue. Formerly they used to claim that their results must necessarily be correct because they had followed a true clue. In the *Ex-*

[1] Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, p. 44.

pository Times for May, 1909, Dr. Skinner wrote as follows: "It is not easy to believe that the clue which led to the discovery of so many affinities, connexions, and diversities was altogether fallacious; but even if it were proved to be so, it would not be the first time that a wrong clue has led to true results. The discovery of America is none the less a solid achievement because Columbus sailed for India. The critical story is a hypothesis, whose justification lies in its capacity to coördinate all the phenomena of a very intricate problem. Whether the hypothesis is sound or the reverse is not now the question; but it is clear that it is not invalidated by the demonstration that a few of the facts which it set out to explain are less certain than was imagined." The comparison with Columbus is altogether typical of the attitude adopted by the higher critics towards their own conclusions. Hereafter we shall see whether the theory does or does not "coördinate all the phenomena of a very intricate problem." But for the present we are concerned with the attitude towards the clue. Formerly the results were true because the clue was also true: now "it is not easy to believe" that it "was altogether fallacious; but even if it were proved to be so, it would not be the first time that a wrong clue has led to true results." That is, the critics are (in their own opinion) right: either because their case was sound, or, failing that, in spite of the fact that it was unsound. This is certainly suggestive of the well-known principle "Heads I win, tails you lose."

THE MEANING OF EXODUS VI. 3

The true meaning of Ex. vi. 3 really falls outside the scope of this pamphlet. Suffice it to say that in the opinion of the writer the reading "I made known" is clearly right. "The

meaning, which at first sight appears to be the same, is seen, in the light of comparative evidence as to primitive ideas, to be absolutely different. It appears that men in a certain state of civilization hold that names have an objective existence, and regard the utterance of a man's name by himself as giving his interlocutor a certain power over him. There is plenty of Old Testament evidence to show that the early Hebrews believed in the objective existence of names. It seems that here the utterance of the Name of God, not in any incidental or evasive fashion (as, for instance, in quotation, 'Thus shalt thou say the LORD,' etc., in Ex. iii. 15), but as a part of the direct formula 'I am the LORD,' would have an esoteric meaning for the ancient Hebrew. The true effect of the phrase was not to reveal a new name or give a fresh meaning to an old one, but to create a bond between Deity and people, and to give Moses and the Israelites a direct pledge that the whole power of this Deity would be exerted on their behalf." [1]

GLOSSES IN THE MASSORETIC TEXT

To return to the higher critical theory:

In considering other portions of the analysis that are refuted by textual criticism, we must take into account another department of that science — the removal of glosses. Here again we can appeal to everyday experience. It is within everybody's knowledge that many men have a tendency to write notes in their books. In an age of printing no confusion can arise, but in the case of a MS. tradition such notes are apt to be incorporated in the text. The testimony of the Ancient Versions shows that this has happened to a very large extent in the Pentateuch; and when the text is critically examined it is remarkable how many words can be removed

[1] The Churchman, April, 1909, pp. 284 f.

without effecting the slightest alteration in the sense. One word that appears to be a gloss in many of its occurrences is "saying." It looks as if in the original narrative far more reliance was placed on the inflections of the voice than in our present text, and it was judged unnecessary to insert any indication that at a particular point a fresh speech was to begin. Again, the textual evidence suggests that the ancient Hebrew narrator in quoting a speech frequently contented himself with the phrase "and he said," but that later readers often inserted both a subject and an indirect object, giving "And A said to B" for the original "And he said." Such additions make no difference to the sense. They really correspond to our system of punctuation. "Saying" is equivalent to opening inverted commas: the addition of the names served to replace in the written text the inflections of the voice that the earlier text akin to and founded on oral narrative had postulated as self-evident. As a rule no importance attaches to such glosses.

CRITICAL BEARINGS OF GLOSSES

Occasionally, however, the views of modern critics have read into the phenomena of the Massoretic text a significance that the textual authorities show to be vain. It happens that a man occasionally has two designations — Jacob-Israel is the most important instance. In such a case the critics sometimes postulate different sources — one of which used the first name and the other the second. Here the textual evidence comes in to show that we often have to deal with nothing more important or significant than the additions of glossators. Those who wish for further information on this point are referred to the discussion of the story of Joseph in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1910, and to the case of Jethro in "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" (pp. 60 f.).

Unfortunately glossators did not always content themselves with the sort of note we have been considering. They sometimes undertook to explain some seeming difficulty, or to add a note on history, or to provide information on some subject. In course of time these additions became incorporated in the text, and have led to considerable trouble. For example, in Ex. xvii. we are told how a place acquired the name of "Massah and Meribah." This creates difficulty, for we know that Kadesh was called Meribah, and Massah is never so designated elsewhere. But the Vulgate did not find "and Meribah" in the text of Ex. xvii. Accordingly it seems that this phrase — constituting a single word in Hebrew — is the erroneous addition of a glossator. Again, in Gen. xxix. 30 it seems probable that the LXX did not find the clause "And served with him yet seven other years." "The statement is clearly the work of a glossator based on the concluding words of verse 27, for we have already been told in verse 28 that 'Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week.' It therefore adds nothing to our information; but, coming in this place, it leads to the erroneous impression that Jacob served seven years for Rachel *after,* and not before, his union with her. In point of fact he served the second period of seven years after marrying Leah and before marrying Rachel, and then served a further period of six years (xxxi. 41). Another interesting example occurs in xxi. 1, where the Septuagintal MS. n omits the words 'And the LORD did unto Sarah as he had spoken.' This leaves the sense unaffected, but it makes the narrative more vigorous and robs the higher critics of a 'doublet.' Examination of the text suggests too that the lists of words on which the critics place so much reliance are largely due to the interpolations of glossators." [1]

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1910, p. 60.

COLENSO ON THE FAMILY OF JUDAH

The addition to Gen. xxix. 30 is of peculiar importance, because it has led to a difficulty in the chronology. "I state the difficulty in Bishop Colenso's words. After showing (from Gen. xlvi. 8, 12, 26, 27; Ex. i. 1, 5; and Deut. x. 22) that the Bible states that Hezron and Hamul went down with Jacob to Egypt, he proceeds thus:—"'Now Judah was forty-two years old, according to the story, when he went down with Jacob into Egypt. But, if we turn to Gen. xxxviii., we shall find that, in the course of these forty-two years of Judah's life, the following events are recorded to have happened:

"'(i) Judah grows up, marries a wife,—"at that time" (ver. 1), that is, after Joseph's being sold into Egypt, when he was "seventeen years old" (Gen. xxxvii. 2) and when Judah, consequently, was, at least, twenty years old,—and has, separately, three sons by her.

"'(ii) The oldest of these three sons grows up, is married, and dies.

"'The second grows to maturity (suppose in another year), marries his brother's widow, and dies.

"'The third grows to maturity (suppose in another year still), but declines to take his brother's widow to wife.

"'She then deceives Judah himself, conceives by him, and in due time bears him twins, Pharez and Zarah.

"'(iii) One of these twins also grows to maturity, and has two sons, Hezron and Hamul, born to him, before Jacob goes down into Egypt.

"'The above being certainly incredible, we are obliged to conclude that one of the two accounts must be untrue. Yet the statement, that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan, is vouched so positively by the many passages

above quoted, which sum up the "seventy souls," that, to give up this point, is to give up an essential part of the whole story. But then this point cannot be maintained, however essential to the narrative, without supposing that the other series of events had taken place beforehand, which we have seen to be incredible.' (Pentateuch (2d ed.), part i. pp. 18, 19.)

"Colenso adds the following important footnote:—

"'Joseph was thirty years old, when he stood "before Pharaoh" as governor of the land of Egypt (Gen. xli. 46); and from that time nine years elapsed (seven of plenty and two of famine) before Jacob came down to Egypt. At that time, therefore, Joseph was thirty-nine years old. But Judah was about three years older than Joseph; for Judah was born in the fourth year of Jacob's double marriage (Gen. xxix. 35) and Joseph in the seventh (Gen. xxx. 24–26; xxxi. 41.) Hence Judah was forty-two years old when Jacob went down to Egypt.'"

THE ANSWER TO COLENSO

"In this passage Colenso can be shown to have made two mistakes. *First,* he is wrong in thinking that Judah can only have been three years older than Joseph; *secondly,* he puts on the words 'at that time' a meaning which the Hebrew does not necessarily bear. I proceed to prove these two points in detail.

"The biblical narrative makes it clear that at least thirteen years — not six or seven — elapsed between the date of Jacob's marriage with Leah and his departure from Aram-Naharaim. To make this point stand out, it will be best to trace Leah's fortunes in the first instance. She married Jacob at the end of the first seven years of his service (Gen. xxix. 20–23). She then bore seven children at different times

before the departure from Laban, which (Gen. xxxi. 41) took place six years after the marriage with Rachel.

"It is not possible to compress these events into six years, even if Gen. xxx. 9, which demands some considerable extension of time, be ignored. This is confirmed by yet another circumstance. The two younger sons and the daughter were not born until *after* the episode of the mandrakes narrated in Gen. xxx. 14–16. But a comparison of the dates will show that if the births of all the children were to be squeezed into six years, Reuben could have been little more than two years old when he got the mandrakes, and that is certainly not probable. The truth is that commentators have been misled by the narrator's method of telling his story.

"It is always possible to group events either chronologically or on some other principle. In this instance a true literary instinct has led the historian to finish the history of Jacob's marriages before he began to speak of his children. The marriage with Leah was a disappointment to the ardent lover, and accordingly we are told how he served another seven years, and then received Rachel as a wife (Gen. xxix. 27–28). Then the story proceeds to speak of the birth of the children, but the narrator does not fail to point out how Providence compensated Leah for her husband's want of affection (ver. 31). In grouping the events in this way, it is clear that he intends to point a moral, not to offer a scheme of chronology. When the chapter is carefully examined, it is plain that the first four sons were born in the early years of Leah's married life, while she was the sole wife, — not, as Colenso says, in the years of the *double* marriage, — and that the marriage with Rachel and the birth of the other children fell between the termination of the fourteenth year of Jacob's service with Laban and the time of his flight. These facts have been ob-

scured by the order of the narrative and the narrator's tendency to moralize, but they entirely harmonize with all we know.

"The second mistake relates to the phrase rendered 'at that time' in Gen. xxxviii. 1. Judah having married 'at that time,' it has been assumed that we must look back to see the last episode mentioned, and infer that the marriage took place *after* that episode. But the usage of the phrase in other portions of the Pentateuch conclusively shows that this argument will not hold water. Thus in Deut. x. 8 ff. Moses tells how 'at that time' God separated the tribe of Levi. Now, whatever view be taken of the preceding verses, — and there is considerable ground for thinking that verses 6 and 7 were not part of the original text — it is difficult to read the phrase as meaning "then next," for the narrative resumes (ver. 10), 'And I stayed in the Mount . . . . forty days,' etc. Clearly the sequence is here not strictly chronological. The mention of the Tables and the Ark in verse 5 reminds Moses that some time about the same period a tribe was set aside to perform the ministry of the Ark, and he uses the phrase rather as indicating a period than as giving a precise date."[1] When Judah's age is worked out in detail in the light of these observations, the time is found to be sufficient for all the events narrated: but an erroneous gloss has clearly made the narrative in Genesis unduly obscure.

THE STORY OF JOSEPH

The story of Joseph is of considerable importance to the critical case because it is the *locus classicus* for the division of J from E. That division depends primarily on the famous "clue." But apart from that clue it is said that there are discrepancies that render necessary the assumption of two

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1907, pp. 12–15.

sources, and the most important of these discrepancies are supplied by the story of Joseph. Attention has already been directed to the most salient of these — the strange alternation of Midianites and Ishmaelites, the confusion between Joseph's master and the keeper of the prison, and the sudden surprising location of the prison in the house of Joseph's master.[1] All these and many other less perplexing features of the story are removed by the textual evidence. The details must be sought in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January and April, 1910, but the outlines must be given here. In chapter xxxvii. it appears that some glosses and two corruptions (one of five letters, the other of three) are responsible for the difficulties. In verse 28 the original text probably had "the Ishmaelites" for the Massoretic "men, Midianites, merchants"; while in verse 36 the Massoretic "Medanites" appears to have replaced an earlier "merchants." Further, in Hebrew, "keeper of the prison" and "captain of the guard" both begin with the same word, and in the passages where the "captain of the guard" causes trouble by his appearance the LXX either omitted the phrase or read "keeper of the prison," in one case with the support of the Vulgate. The original text of the LXX in chapter xl. 1–7 appears to have run as follows:

"And it came to pass after these things, that the butler of the king of Egypt and his baker offended their lord the king of Egypt, and he was wroth against his two officers. And he put them in ward into the prison, the place where Joseph was bound. And the keeper of the prison charged Joseph with them, and he ministered unto them: and they continued a season in ward. And they dreamed a dream both of them in one night. And Joseph came in unto them in the morning, and

[1] *Supra*, pp. 8 f.

saw them, and, behold, they were sad. And he asked them, Wherefore look ye so sadly to-day?"

Anybody who will compare this with the ordinary text of the English Versions will see that the superior brevity of this form of the narrative is not secured by the omission of any fact, but merely by the adoption of a shorter form of words. The additional words in the Massoretic text appear to be the explanatory notes of glossators. They detract from the literary merit of the narrative without conferring any compensating advantage.

KORAH, DATHAN, AND ABIRAM

The narrative of Korah's revolt provides us with another instance of the importance of textual criticism. "Once more," writes Dr. Carpenter, "the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in Num. xvi., issues in the strange result that their two hundred and fifty followers (ver. 2) are first engulfed in the midst of all their possessions (ver. 32), and then devoured by fire at the entrance of the tent of meeting (ver. 35)."[1] It seems a pity to spoil so picturesque a conclusion, yet it is necessary to point out that the difficulties of the chapter arise merely from the state of the text. The original appears to have told how Korah and his company were assembled in one place while Dathan and Abiram stood by their tents. In verses 24 and 27 the author seems to have written "Get you up from about the congregation of Korah. . . . So they got them up from the congregation of Korah on every side." In both verses a corruption of a few letters set in, "Dwelling" taking the place of "congregation." Glossators added Dathan and Abiram, who, according to verses 25 and 27, were not with Korah, with the result that in both places the Massoretic text

[1] **Oxford Hexateuch, vol. i. p. 32.**

presents the unintelligible phrase "the Dwelling of Korah, Dathan and Abiram." Fortunately the Septuagintal authorities tell us the tale. Dathan and Abiram, their households, and the household of Korah were swallowed by the earth: Korah and his two hundred and fifty were consumed by fire. This is confirmed by the Samaritan text of Num. xxvi. 10, from which it appears that that verse originally ran: "And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, when the company died, what time the fire consumed Korah and two hundred and fifty men." The correctness of these variants is attested by independent considerations. For example, Deuteronomy mentions Dathan and Abiram without Korah, while Num. xxvii. 3 speaks of Korah without Dathan and Abiram. Again, even the critics cannot make the existing text of Num. xvi. fit their theory, but have to assign "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram" in verses 24 and 27, and also other phrases, to harmonists — of course without consulting the textual authorities. It is really very strange that men who felt that the Massoretic text could not be supported should not have troubled to examine the ancient authorities for guidance before embarking on an ocean of the wildest and most subjective speculation.

DERANGEMENTS OF ORDER

Yet another set of phenomena are explained by another department of textual criticism. It has often been noted that the order of the narratives in the Pentateuch is sometimes extremely strange. There are occasions when we can say definitely, for one reason or another, that the order is out of correspondence with the actual sequence of events or with any intelligible narrative principle. For example, in Ex. xviii. we learn of a visit paid by Jethro to Moses when he was en-

camped at the Mount of God; but it is not till the next chapter that we read of the arrival of the Israelites at this Mount. In Lev. ix. 22 we read of Aaron's blessing the people; the command to bless is, however, not given till Num. vi. 22–27. In Num. xxi. 1–3 we learn of a campaign conducted against Arad in the south of Canaan: yet, according to the sequence of the narrative, the Israelites were at that time on a southward march to the Red Sea from Kadesh, a place that itself is south, and not north, of Arad. These instances — which could easily be multiplied — show that the order of our present Pentateuch is not chronological. In some cases it cannot even be topical, as is shown by the instance of the Arad campaign. At this point other evidence comes to our aid. Sometimes Deuteronomy clearly testifies to a different arrangement of the material as having been original. The most important example of this is the statement of the sojourn at Kadesh. In i. 40 we are told, as in Numbers, that the Israelites were commanded to turn and take their journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea. Then follows a narrative of their disobedience and consequent defeat. The speaker continues: "So ye abode in Kadesh many days, according unto the days that ye abode. Then we turned, and took our journey into the wilderness by the way to the Red Sea, as the LORD spake unto me: and we compassed Mount Seir many days. . . . And the days in which we came from Kadesh-barnea, until we were come over the brook Zered, were thirty and eight years" (Deut. i. 46; ii. 1, 14). This naturally means that the Israelites after a stay at Kadesh left at some date in the third year and never returned to it. No such narrative can be derived from the statements of Numbers in their present order: but if we take Deuteronomy as a witness to the *text* of Numbers, and see whether the statement can be extracted from the lat-

ter book in this way, we find that by combining the first half of Num. xx. 22 with the second half of Num. xxi. 4 we obtain the narrative of Deuteronomy. The result reads, "And they journeyed from Kadesh by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom," etc. If this be correct, the intervening portion must have been inserted in its present place by accident, and that would account for the extraordinary geographical difficulty of the Arad campaign. What should we have to postulate to account for such a displacement? Nothing beyond what is within everybody's experience. When a leaf falls out of a book we frequently misplace it instead of putting it into its right position. There is little excuse for us nowadays, seeing that our books have pages and these are numbered: but the case was different with MS. texts some twenty-five centuries ago. A reader might hunt diligently for the right place and yet make a mistake. Once he had come to a wrong conclusion in the matter the harm would be perpetuated. Indeed it might be greatly extended, for a subsequent reader might realize that the narrative was not in order, and in seeking to remedy the trouble he might introduce fresh mistakes. There is some reason for believing that in some cases the present difficulty of the order of the Pentateuchal sections is due to mistaken efforts to improve errors of position. In this particular instance other clues can be found when the narrative is carefully examined. In Num. xxi. 3 we read: "And they devoted them and their cities: and the name of the place was called Hormah." This certainly looks as if it were intended to be the first mention of Hormah: yet in the present arrangement of the text we find the name "Hormah" occurring without any explanation in Num. xiv. 45. When this is added to the other phenomena to which attention has been called, it becomes natural to wonder whether the Arad

campaign did not in fact take place before the defeat when the Israelites were driven to Hormah. But one consideration leads to another, and once this idea is suggested we see that another difficulty suddenly disappears. In the present narrative, Num. xxi. 1–3 gives rise to the question "Why did the Israelites evacuate this country which they had already conquered?" If the narrative really refers to something that preceded the bad defeat, the answer is obvious. The Israelites were routed on the scene of their former victory, and found that they could not hold the territory of Arad. When these and other considerations are weighed together, it becomes clear that a very large number of miscellaneous difficulties can be solved by the supposition that, as the result of the vicissitudes undergone by the text, the order has suffered derangement. The detailed discussion will be found on pages 114–138 of "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." Here it is sufficient to observe that a whole host of problems — chronological, geographical, literary, and historical — can be solved by this method, while serious discrepancies between Deuteronomy and Numbers also disappear.

OTHER TRANSPOSITIONS

Sometimes the LXX presents verses in a different order, and thereby shows that transpositions have taken place in one or other of the texts that have come down to us. This phenomenon again strengthens the view already taken, that many of our difficulties are due to errors in the order of the existing text and result merely from the vicissitudes of transmission, not from difference of authorship.

Consequently there can be nothing more legitimate than to consider whether some further transposition may not have taken place before any of the Versions were made in other

passages where Deuteronomy does not touch on the narrative of the earlier books. Such transpositions, as we have already seen, might be due to a purely accidental cause, i.e. the insertion of a portion of a deranged MS. in the wrong place. In such a case, however, the incoherence of the narrative and internal evidence will show us that there is something wrong. In many cases the internal evidence may even go further and suggest the right position for the misplaced passage.

THE TENT OF MEETING

A striking instance is afforded by the narrative of the Tent of Meeting in Ex. xxxiii. 7–11. It has already been shown that this creates great difficulties[1]. This tent cannot be identified with the Tabernacle, for which instructions had been given in chapters xxv. ff., for many reasons. The Tabernacle had not yet been constructed: when made it was to serve quite a different purpose, being designed as the dwelling-place of the Ark, which had not yet come into existence: it was to stand in the center of the camp, not outside; to be served by priests, not Joshua; to be of a weight, design, and size that would have made its transport by a single man an impossibility. Further, the narrative has no intelligible connection with the context. If, however, we try the effects of transposition, the whole difficulty suddenly disappears, for there is a place where this narrative fits exactly. Indeed, we have various clues to guide us. Joshua first appears in our present text in chapter xvii. 9. No introduction of any sort is given; he is spoken of as a person already known. Yet in this passage he is treated as previously unknown: "his servant Joshua, son of Nun, a young man." Clearly an order that placed this passage *before* xvii. would be more natural, so far as Joshua is concerned. Next, it appears that every one which sought the Lord used

[1] *Supra*, pp. 3 f.

to go out to this Tent. Exodus xviii. presents us with another picture; and, as we know from the statements of that chapter, it relates to the period at Horeb. In that case whosoever sought God went to Moses — obviously in the midst of the camp, for all the people stood by him. Which of these two representations refers to the earlier period in point of time? The answer is supplied by the passages that show us Moses sitting in the midst of the camp at the door of the Tabernacle: "Then came the daughters of Zelophehad . . . . and they stood before Moses, and before Eleazar the priest, and before the princes and all the congregation by the door of the Tent of Meeting" (Num. xxvii.).

That was the later practice after the Tabernacle had been erected. Therefore this clue also points to the assignment of Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 to an earlier date. Further, some such arrangements for the administration of justice as are here made are postulated by the narrative of xxiv. 14. Moses there makes special arrangements for the transaction of judicial business during the period that he was in the Mount. This implies that up to that time he had tried all the cases as they arose, and we should expect a statement to that effect at the beginning of the narrative of the wanderings. If, now, we follow up these clues and look for a suitable position to which to transfer Ex. xxxiii. 7–11, we find one place where it fits like a glove. That is after xiii. 22. We have just been told how the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night were always before the people. Correcting the rendering of xxxiii. 7, which is mistranslated in the Revised Version, we may read "And Moses used to take *a* [or "the"] tent and pitch it *for himself* without the camp, afar off from the camp. . . . And it came to pass, as Moses came to the tent the pillar of cloud used to descend and stand at the door of the tent, and

speak with Moses." This statement of the habitual descents of the pillar of cloud attaches naturally to the earlier narrative of its constant presence. As a provision for the trial of cases, Ex. xxxiii. 7–11 then stands in its most natural position, and all the subsequent arrangements become more intelligible. Moreover, we are introduced to Joshua naturally and suitably.

JOSHUA'S SUPPOSED PRIESTHOOD

We have seen that the rendering of the Revised Version of Ex. xxxiii. 7 must be corrected to bring it into accord with the Hebrew, which distinctly says that Moses used to pitch the tent " for himself." In view of the theory of Wellhausen that Joshua was the minister of a sanctuary in E, this phrase has a very special importance. The line of reasoning was as follows: the tent existed for the Ark: therefore, Joshua, left in charge of the tent, was in charge of the Ark: therefore, the conception of law and history is entirely different from that which places the ministry of the Ark solely in the charge of priests, sons of Aaron, and Levites, for Joshua was an Ephraimite. All this is demolished by the little Hebrew monosyllable which means " for himself." If Moses took a (or the) tent outside the camp and pitched it *for himself*, it follows of necessity that the tent in question was *not* the abode of the Ark, for we cannot conceive that he left the Ark (which, by the way, had not yet come into existence, according to the actual biblical narrative, as contrasted with the narrative imagined by the critical school) in the middle of the camp without its natural covering, bared and unguarded, while removing its tent to a distance for his own private purposes. If, however, we are to suppose that he actually did take this course, then Joshua was not in charge of the Ark, since on this wonderful hypothesis it was in the midst of the camp while Joshua was in the

tent "afar off from the camp." In point of fact, this alleged priesthood of Joshua in E is a perversion of the facts of that "document." In Deut. xxxiii. 8 ff. it most distinctly assigns the priesthood to Levi, not to Ephraim: in x. 6 it speaks of the priesthood of Aaron and Eleazar: in the book of Joshua it recognizes priests in charge of the Ark who are absolutely distinct from the Ephraimite leader. There is no tittle of evidence for the priesthood of Joshua, and the whole case rests on a mistranslation of Ex. xxxiii. 7. Never in any document does Joshua perform any priestly function whatsoever.

THE NUMBERS OF THE ISRAELITES

Before passing from this department of the reply to the higher critics, something should be said of another set of difficulties that find an easy solution by means of textual criticism, viz. the numbers of the Israelites. There can be but few readers who have not heard of the controversy connected with the name of Colenso. There have been many answers to his attack on the numbers of the Israelites as given in the Massoretic text, but candor compels the admission that, fairly considered, the answers are not convincing. Yet if we turn to the textual considerations we find reason to believe that the present form of the numbers is not original. Palæographical science proves that there was a time when *e. g.* the same characters could be read either as forty thousand or four thousand, and that errors of transmission could arise very easily in this way. The details are too technical for a publication of this kind, and must be sought in the writer's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." Here it is sufficient to say that those who are prepared to go into the evidence will find that there is an easy and natural solution available which leaves the view taken of the authorship of the Pentateuch unchanged.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF NUMBERS

The first (and most celebrated) part of Colenso's famous book on the Pentateuch was based on three sets of difficulties: those connected with the chronology of Judah; those relating to the numbers of the Pentateuch; and, finally, those arising in the chronology of the concluding chapters of Numbers. It has been shown that textual criticism can solve the first two sets of difficulties. What about the third? Reasons have been given above to prove that the order of the present text of Numbers is not original. When it is rectified, Colenso's difficulties are to a great extent relieved; but even so they do not entirely disappear. They all depend on one word in the Hebrew text — the word "fifth" in Num. xxxiii. 38, where we are told that Aaron died on the first day of the fifth month. The subsequent events can scarcely be fitted into the time this leaves. The Syriac, however, preserves a different reading. According to this authority the event occurred in the *first,* not the fifth month, and this reading quite answers all Colenso's objections. It is thus that an error of a few letters made by a copyist transcribing a badly written text can introduce extraordinary difficulties that will baffle even the acutest scholars if they refuse to avail themselves of the resources of textual criticism.

It should be added that there are other chronological difficulties in Genesis which yield to textual treatment. A typical example will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1910.

III

THE ARGUMENTS FROM LAW AND HISTORY

PERHAPS the portions of the higher critical theory that carry most weight at present are the arguments from the laws and the historical reconstruction. Many men who care little about the apportionment of individual verses to different sources find a fascination in a broad rewriting of history on a large scale. Moreover, alleged discrepancies in the legislation form an important branch of the case for the analysis. For this reason these arguments will be taken at once, though it might be more logical to deal first with the so-called "literary" portion of the higher critical case.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE LAWS

It is not difficult to state in general outline what has happened and how the present state of affairs has come about. Criticism found in the Pentateuch a body of laws: it also found a traditional interpretation of those laws, going back in principle at least as far as the age of Nehemiah. Testing this interpretation, it was able to show with ease that it neither made the legislation into a consistent, and intelligible whole nor accorded with the views of the prophets and the earlier historical books. So far the criticism was justifiable. It should have led the critics to submit the legislation to experts and discover whether any other interpretation was possible. Instead of this, they proceeded to assume that they were themselves competent to discuss these intricate questions, and this has led to disastrous results. Hence it has come about that the perfectly authentic legislation of Moses is regarded

by them as the work of literary impostors. The truth is that many centuries after the death of Moses historical necessities led — as they have done in the case of every other unchangeable legislation — to a particular method of interpreting his laws with a view to making them applicable to the requirements of a later age; but if we wish to understand the true original meaning we must go behind this interpretation to the laws themselves, and read them in the light of the circumstances of the time for which they were given.

AN UNANSWERED CHALLENGE

In this connection attention may be drawn to the following passage from an article contributed by the present writer to the *Churchman* for January, 1908.

"First, then, as I have repeatedly pointed out, the higher critics, although dealing with what is avowedly an old law book, have never taken the trouble to consult any independent lawyer. There appears to be doubt in some minds as to the accuracy of this statement. Accordingly, I may properly quote a letter I received from a higher critic, together with my reply. My correspondent wrote: 'I must admit that I am naturally impressed when I find legal men of repute abroad, who have studied the subject impartially, endorsing the methods and the essential conclusions of recent criticism.' To which I replied as follows: 'I understand you to say that "legal men of repute abroad, who have studied the subject impartially, endorse the methods and the essential conclusions of recent criticism." May I have a reference to these men and their works? I am acquainted with some writers of whom you may be thinking; but, as they avowedly take over the conclusions of the higher critics ready-made, without *any* study (impartial or other) of the grounds of those conclus-

ions, they could scarcely be covered by your description. Most of the legal work that I have seen on the Pentateuch is exceedingly superficial, and adopts the views of either critics or rabbis or both without independent investigation.' The reply to that letter contained no references; indeed, my correspondent was most careful not to allude to the subject again. And if any reader of the *Churchman* should find himself confronted with such a statement, I should be obliged by his obtaining references and sending them to me. The matter can then be investigated, and the work of the 'legal men of repute abroad' can be subjected to proper tests." [1]

The writer has not yet received any references. He will be obliged to any reader of these lines who can compel the higher critics to break silence on this point.

WELLHAUSEN ON SANCTUARIES

The foregoing observations will become much easier to follow when the concrete cases are considered, and to this we must now proceed. Fortunately there is one topic — sanctuaries — to which special importance attaches, and accordingly we shall do well to consider that first.

It will be remembered, from what has already been said,[2] that Wellhausen and his followers distinguish three main stages of law and history — those of JE, D, and P respectively. At first, they say, there was no slaughter without sacrifice. The eating of meat was a rarity. When it occurred, a formal sacrifice of a domestic animal took place, and a sacrificial meal followed. But sacrifice requires an altar, and therefore we find a law that allows of any number of altars. It also demands a sacrificant, and accordingly any layman

[1] The Churchman, January, 1908, pp. 16 f.
[2] *Supra*, pp. 16 f.

might sacrifice. Historically the critics point to the altars erected by the patriarchs and by prominent men in the post-Mosaic period. The Law is found in Ex. xx. 24–26: "An altar of earth thou mayest make unto me, and mayest sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen; in every place (*or* in all the place) where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones. . . . Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar." The force of these provisions may be brought out clearly by other passages. Take, for instance, Ex. xxvii. 1–8, containing the instructions for the making of the altar of burnt offering. No one who reads that passage can suppose that such a structure as that contemplated by Ex. xx. is there intended. But, if we turn to the account of the altar constructed by Elijah on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 30–32), or the great stone rolled at Saul's command after the battle of Michmash to serve as an altar (1 Sam. xiv. 33–35) or the rock on which Manoah sacrificed (Jud. xiii. 19), or the narrative in which Naaman asks for two mules' burden of earth (2 Kings v. 17), we shall see Ex. xx. in operation.

Wellhausen and his followers accordingly say that this law permits sacrifice at any place of peculiar sanctity where there had been a theophany, though sometimes the theophany followed instead of preceding the sacrificial act. There is indeed a historical period which is in accordance with the requirements of that law, but, as we shall have to note hereafter, it does not follow that the period is not also in accordance with other requirements. The book of Deuteronomy insists strongly on the importance of the religious capital and recognizes the legitimacy of non-sacrificial slaughter of domestic animals for food. In the view of the critics it thus makes possible for the

first time a non-religious killing for food and prohibits local altars. It resulted in Josiah's reformation. Finally the priestly legislation in or after the exile assumes the single central sanctuary as axiomatic, and never even contemplates the possibility of local sacrifice.

THE ANSWER TO WELLHAUSEN

Every single point in this scheme is open to refutation. If it were true that non-sacrificial slaughter was impossible until the publication of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah, it would necessarily follow that the earlier narratives would know nothing of such slaughter. Yet we find instance after instance of ordinary killing without altar or sacrifice, and when critics are asked about these they meet all questions with silence. Abraham prepares a calf in Gen. xviii. 7, but there is no sign of altar or religious rite; Jacob and Rebecca were certainly not responsible for a sacrifice in Gen. xxvii. 9–14, nor was Joseph's steward in xliii. 16. The law of Ex. xxii. 1 (Heb. xxi. 37) speaks of the killing of stolen animals as a perfectly natural occurrence, but assuredly does not contemplate a religious ceremony. Nor can we find such in 1 Sam. xxv. 11 or xxviii. 24. It skills not to multiply instances. This portion of the theory breaks down under the impact of the facts. Its other branches are no happier.

SACRIFICE WITHOUT THEOPHANY

We find one instance after another of sacrifice at places where no theophany can be suggested. Saul's altar after Michmash, Samuel's at Ramah, Adonijah's sacrifice at En-rogel, Naaman's earth, David's clan sacrifice in 1 Sam. xx. 6, 29, Abram's altars near Bethel (Gen. xii. 8) and at Mamre (xiii. 18), Jacob's sacrifices in Gen. xxxi. 54 and xxxiii. 20 are all examples. Thus we find that in Ex. xx. we must render

"in *all* the place where I cause my name to be remembered," and understand it not of theophanies, but of the territory of Israel for the time being.

HOUSE OF GOD AND LAY ALTARS

When we examine the data of JE, we find that, though its laws admit of a number of altars of earth or stone, they also recognize a single "House of the LORD." Now a house is not a stone or a mound of earth or stone, and, conversely, a mound is not a house. This remark may appear so obvious as to be ludicrous. Unfortunately in this department of the subject nothing is too obvious for emphasis. The fact is that it is possible for men living many centuries after the laws have ceased to operate to confuse objects which no eye-witness could have failed to distinguish. A modern professor can call a stone a "sanctuary" and then mistake it for a house, but no contemporary could have done so. A very curious illustration of this truth may prove interesting. Ex. xxi. begins with a law relating to slaves, and it is provided that in certain eventualities a slave is to be taken to "*Elohim*" — translated "God" by the Revised Version, but "judges" by the Authorized — and brought to the door or door-post, and there have his ear perforated. The higher critics, full of their theory of the "plurality of sanctuaries," at once say that this rite is to take place at a "sanctuary." If, however, we ask what "sanctuaries" the law of Ex. xx. permits, we shall find that it allows only altars of earth or stone; and when we look at the historical instances, we see that they show us such altars, and nothing more. Let the reader think of Elijah on Carmel, Saul after Michmash, Manoah's rock, or any other of the numerous examples we find in the historical books, and let him ask himself whether any of the altars there contem-

plated could by any possibility have had doors or door-posts, or could have developed them on being called "sanctuaries" by modern writers. Importance attaches to this point because it shows so clearly what value should be assigned to the paper criticism of modern theorists. How can any man who cannot distinguish between a stone and a house, because he has first fuddled himself by calling both "sanctuaries," claim to speak with authority on complicated questions of historical development, or pretend to possess any insight into the meaning and working of institutions? The laws of JE recognize a plurality of altars, and, as these are for purposes of lay sacrifice, we may properly term them "lay altars"; but this does not justify us in saying that a plurality of "sanctuaries" is here permitted. Side by side with these altars we see in the laws something else — a house of the LORD — and after what has been said it is plain that this is quite different from a lay altar. We meet with similar phenomena alike in the history and in Deuteronomy. If we find many lay altars, we also know of a House of the LORD at Shiloh at which sacrifices were performed with the assistance of a priesthood. Similarly, later on, in addition to the Temple, we see Naaman seeking earth for an altar, and we conclude that in the history, as in the Law, it was possible for Temple and lay altars to subsist side by side. Nay, more, we find that the altar of the house was an entirely different object from the lay altar. We have seen that Ex. xx. requires an altar of earth or *unhewn* stones. Without hewing these stones, horns could not be formed. Yet we repeatedly meet with an altar *with* horns at the house, i.e. an altar of the type of Ex. xxvii., quite unlike the lay altars. In proof of this, reference may be made to 1 Kings i. 50 f. and 1 Kings ii. 28 ff., showing us an altar with horns *before* the erection of the temple in the very age in

which lay altars were common. That altar stood in front of the Ark, i.e. it was the altar of the temporary "house" of God. Again, Deut. xvi. 21 recognizes these lay altars as fully as Ex. xx., so that the two bodies of law agree. Then it becomes necessary to inquire what offerings could or should be brought to each.

THE TRIPLE SYSTEM OF OFFERINGS

Close investigation shows that the sacrificial law recognized a triple system of offerings. Before the days of Moses, a custom had grown up by which every Israelite could sacrifice on an occasion of joy or solemnity. The legislation in no wise seeks to abrogate this custom, but it contains provisions like the law of Ex. xx., which, while recognizing its validity, strove to protect it from possible abuses. These sacrifices, then, we may call customary lay offerings, because they rest on custom and are offered by laymen without priestly assistance. Moses, however, introduced two other kinds of offerings — national offerings, such as we find in Num. xxviii. f. (which were brought on behalf of the whole people and not on behalf of any individual), and another class of individual offerings, which were to be presented at the House of God with priestly assistance. These may fairly be called "statutory individual offerings" — statutory, because they rest on express enactment, and not on custom, as was the case with the first class; individual, because they were presented by individuals, and not on behalf of the whole nation, as was the case with the second class. Hence laws relating to customary burnt-offerings and peace-offerings recognize their presentation at lay altars, while laws treating of statutory individual burnt-offerings and peace-offerings require that they should be brought to the House of God.

THE PILGRIMAGES IN JE

In point of fact the statutory individual offerings are recognized in JE as fully as elsewhere. Three times a year the Israelite was to present himself before the LORD. The critics wish that to be understood of a local "sanctuary," but in vain. One of the appearances was on "the feast of weeks, of the *bikkurim* (a kind of first-fruits) of wheat harvest" (Ex. xxxiv. 22). Now according to JE, the *bikkurim* were to be brought to the house of the LORD (Ex. xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 26). No contemporary could possibly have mistaken a lay altar of earth for the house served by priests who were to have the *bikkurim*. Hence religious capital and pilgrimages with their consequent offerings are as well known to this part of the legislation as to D or P.

THE SELF-CONSISTENCY OF THE LEGISLATION

Thus, when all the available facts are fully and fairly examined, the Pentateuchal legislation on these matters is seen to form a single consistent whole, and the practice of the succeeding ages affords us illustrations of its working. After the exile, circumstances had changed, and an interpretation was placed on the provisions of the Law which, however suitable to the necessities of the period, was not in accordance with what was historically the meaning of the legislation. The exile had stopped the lay offerings that had been so frequent before but could not be offered in a foreign land (cp. the case of Naaman who took Israelitish *earth* in order to be able to sacrifice to Israel's God when he was not in Canaan). Hence the laws came to be construed in the light of new conditions by men who were not familiar with the original meaning, and this has given rise to trouble.

In outline this is the answer to the most important portion

of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis — a portion that rests mainly on Wellhausen's inability to distinguish between a house and a mound when once he had dubbed both "sanctuaries." The whole question will be found fully discussed in Chapter VI. of "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." Its full consideration is too technical for such a discussion as the present.

THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES

From the consideration of the places and classes of sacrifice, it is natural to turn to those whose aid was essential to the due performance of many sacrificial rites. Here the critical school present us with numerous difficulties in the laws, and also with a quantity of historical reconstruction. Wellhausen himself goes so far as to say that "the position of the Levites is the Achilles heel of the Priestly Code." It is therefore necessary to look into this portion of the critical case with some care. A sketch of the constructive history of the critical school may first be given.

THE WELLHAUSEN RECONSTRUCTION

Originally Levite was the name of a professional priest (Ex. iv. 14; Judges xvii. 7 "of the tribe of Judah"), though there had also been an old secular tribe of this name. In the early history we find laymen who are made priests — David's sons (2 Sam. viii. 18), Ira the Jairite (2 Sam. xx. 26), Zabud, son of Nathan, the prophet (1 Kings iv. 5). Samuel, an Ephraimite, sleeps next the Ark and ministers as a priest in an ephod of linen. David and Solomon bless the people like the priests of P. The first important reference to the Levites is in Deut. xxxiii. 8 ff., an older poem included in E. Here all Levites exercise priestly functions. This is the standpoint of Deuteronomy in the reign of Josiah. In this document we do

not hear of "priests sons of Aaron," and "Levites," as two separate classes: rather priests and Levites are identified. Thus the phrase "the priests, the Levites" occurs frequently, and in one passage (xviii. 1) we even read of "the priests, the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi." In xviii. 6–8 it is expressly enacted that any Levite coming to the capital is to "minister there . . . . as do all his brethren the Levites which stand there before the LORD. They shall have like portions to eat," etc. This, it is said, refers to the dispossessed priests of the high places that were abolished by Josiah's reformation. (This part of the scheme, of course, depends on the theory of a plurality of lawful "sanctuaries" in the earlier time, and falls with it.)

EZEKIEL

Then Ezekiel puts forward a program in a passage of supreme importance, which must be quoted in full:

"And thou shalt say to the rebellious, even to the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord GOD: O ye house of Israel, let it suffice you of all your abominations, in that ye have brought in aliens, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to profane it, even my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and ye [so read with LXX, Syriac, Vulgate] have broken my covenant with [so read with LXX, Syriac, Vulgate] all your abominations. And ye have not kept the charge of mine holy things: but ye have set [read probably "them as," changing one letter of the Hebrew] keepers of my charge in my sanctuary. Therefore [so read with LXX] thus saith the Lord GOD: No alien, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any alien that is among the children of Israel. But the Levites that went far from me, when Israel went astray, which went astray from me after their idols; they shall

bear their iniquity. Yet they shall be ministers in my sanctuary, having oversight at the gates of the house, and ministering in the house; *they* shall slay the burnt-offering and the sacrifice for the people, and *they* shall stand before them to minister unto them. Because they ministered unto them before their idols, and became a stumbling-block of iniquity unto the house of Israel; therefore have I lifted up mine hand against them, saith the Lord GOD, and they shall bear their iniquity. And they shall not come near unto me, to execute the office of priest unto me, nor to come near to any of my holy things, unto the things that are most holy: but they shall bear their shame, and their abominations which they have committed. Yet will I make them keepers of the charge of the house for all the service thereof, and for all that shall be done therein. But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, *they* shall come near to me to minister unto me and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and blood, saith the Lord GOD: *they* shall enter into my sanctuary, and *they* shall come near to my table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge."[1]

Two points are made on this passage. In the temple of Solomon, uncircumcised strangers must have performed duties that ought only to have been discharged by members of the priestly tribe. It is admitted quite fairly that this could easily be explained by the hypothesis that abuses had crept in. But the second point is considered more important. Ezekiel is here introducing a new distinction — the difference between the sons of Zadok and the other Levites — and he is introducing it avowedly as a complete novelty. Nay, more, he makes this a punishment for the Levites who went astray

[1] Ezek. xliv. 6–16.

after the idols. It is a conscious and intentional degradation. Had they remained faithful, they would have been entitled to full priestly rights, but as they had been disloyal, they are now "to bear their iniquity." How could Ezekiel have written thus if he had been acquainted with P, a law of Mosaic origin giving to these Levites as a privilege that which the prophet now assigns to them as a punishment, and carrying back to the days of the desert that which he now introduces as a new scheme? Does not this prove amply that Ezekiel was unacquainted with P, that the division between priests and Levites originated in the brain of the prophet, and was then represented by the priestly writer as dating back to the earliest period of national independence?

Lastly comes the Chronicler. In the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, we see the division between priests and Levites consummated, and the earlier history rewritten to bring it into accordance with this idea. Thus P comes between Ezekiel and the Chronicler. He takes up the views of the one; the other represents the working of his completed system. Ezekiel from being the most unintelligible writer in the Hebrew Canon becomes the "father of Judaism."

ATTRACTIVENESS OF THIS THEORY

That is the theory, and in many ways it is an extremely brilliant theory. It contains valuable elements: when the history of the critical movement comes to be written in full, it is probable that this theory will be recognized as having contained one of its most pregnant contributions to our knowledge of the history, religion, and literature of ancient Israel. It restores one of the major prophets to a place of honor that he never occupied in the conservative scheme, although of course it is fatal to the Law. But, like the rest of Well-

hausen's historical reconstruction, this theory will not bear examination. Yet, when proper tests are applied, it appears that the good part of the theory — the rehabilitation of Ezekiel — largely remains, while the Mosaic authenticity of P emerges greatly reinforced. Here, as elsewhere, the critics have mistaken the casket for the jewel, and have assumed that because the former is made of baser metal, the latter cannot be distinguished from it. But the Law is not necessarily identical with the latest traditional explanations or even with the latest form of the text: and it can be shown that the true course of history was quite different from that sketched by the critical school.

THE TRUE COURSE OF THE HISTORY

In outline that course is as follows: Moses set apart the tribe of Levi for certain desert services. These would cease with the conquest of Canaan and the erection of the Tent of Meeting at Shiloh. At the same time he delivered a body of law which could easily be administered by the family of Aaron during the desert period, but necessitated the creation of a numerous and scattered priesthood for its application in settled conditions. In Deuteronomy the natural solution of the problem thus created was adopted; but, unfortunately, a glossator who read the words of Moses many centuries after his death, when conditions were entirely different, adopted a very natural misunderstanding of his meaning and inserted a single word of explanation. The explanation was historically erroneous, and consequently its presence in our text has made the provisions of the law as to Levites and the work of Ezekiel unintelligible. That word is fortunately missing in some Septuagintal MSS. and should be removed. It is the Hebrew word for "the Levites" in Deut. xviii. 7. Moses enacted that

any Levite coming to the religious capital could minister "as all his brethren do which stand there before the LORD." That would place him on a level with the sons of Aaron: and we do, in fact, find that all our authorities from Deuteronomy to Malachi regard the priesthood as Levitical. But later a change set in, and in the days of the glossator priests and Levites were two sharply distinguished classes. Hence he thought that "his brethren" meant "his fellow-Levites," and added his unhappy note. In point of fact he misread the meaning of Deuteronomy in the light of the circumstances of his own age. From the time of Deuteronomy onwards the legitimate priesthood was Levitical save in the northern kingdom. Priests and Levites are identified in the book of Joshua. Judges bears witness to the special character of a Levite. The author of Kings complains that Jeroboam "made priests from among all the people, which were not of the sons of Levi" (1 Kings xii. 31), *not*, be it observed, "which were not of the sons of Aaron." Jeremiah (xxxiii. 17–24) and Malachi (ii.) are in exact agreement with this. So is Ezekiel, for the passage quoted above shows that he recognized the priestly right of all Levites as historically true. But he seeks to introduce a change in punishment for the idolatry of all save the sons of Zadok, i.e. the priests of Solomon's temple. And so he goes back to the old desert distinction by which the whole priestly tribe was divided into two classes — a higher and a lower — and he reintroduces it in a modified form. For the sons of Aaron he substitutes the sons of Zadok — who had been made high priest by Solomon (1 Kings ii. 35; cp. 27) — and he reenacts for them, with slight modifications, the Mosaic legislation as to the sons of Aaron. To the lower grade he assigns duties that had been performed by foreigners. His language is borrowed from the Pentateuch, but he invests the terms

used with a new meaning. Subsequently his influence prevailed and the distinction between priests and Levites is seen after the Exile.

THE CHOICE OF VIEWS

In deciding between these alternatives several considerations must be carefully weighed. Does P really contemplate the Mosaic age or the time of the second temple? Was Ezekiel acquainted with P or not? Are institutions claimed to be post-exilic found in operation before the exile? Can the general analysis of the Pentateuch and the dating presupposed by the Wellhausen theory be successfully maintained? To a great extent these questions are discussed in other parts of the present volume, but some points that bear especially on the present topic must be treated here.

THE LEVITES IN "P"

When the provisions relating to the Levites in P are carefully scrutinized, they leave no doubt as to the purely transitory nature of the duties assigned to them. Thus Num. i. 50–53 provides as follows:

"And do thou appoint the Levites over the dwelling of the testimony and over all its furniture and over all that belongeth to it, *they* shall carry the dwelling and all its furniture and *they* shall serve it, and round about the dwelling shall they camp. And when the dwelling setteth forward the Levites shall take it down, and when the dwelling is to be pitched the Levites shall set it up, and the stranger that cometh nigh shall die. . . . And the Levites shall pitch round about the dwelling of the testimony . . . . and the Levites shall have the charge of the dwelling of the testimony."

It would be out of place here to consider in minute detail the other passages involved. Those who desire such a dis-

cussion will find it in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1910. But one and all of them bear witness to the same truth — the fact that the duties assigned to the Levites in Numbers are duties of porterage, and so forth, that could not possibly be discharged once the Ark had found a permanent resting-place after the conquest — as it in fact did at Shiloh. If we further test the meaning of P by comparing the duties assigned to the Levites by Ezekiel and Chronicles, we find that P excludes the possibility of their performing the same functions as in the latter books. For example, *slaying* the burnt-offering and the sacrifice is mentioned by Ezekiel, but in P the sacrificant performs this duty himself (Lev. i. ff.). So, too, with Chronicles. When we read that the Levites were "for the service of the House of the LORD over the courts, and over the chambers, and over the cleansing of every holy thing" (1 Chron. xxiii. 28), we remember not merely that such duties nowhere appear in P, but that that document knows nothing of any chambers, would not have allowed the Levites to touch many of the holy things, and regarded service simply as porterage. Again, 1 Chron. xxiii. 31 assigns to the Levites the task of offering burnt-offerings on certain occasions; but P expressly forbids their approaching the altar (Num. xviii. 3) on pain of death to both Levites and priests! After a detailed examination of the facts, I have summed up the results in an article that appeared in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July, 1910, as follows:

P DOES NOT REFLECT POST-EXILIC CONDITIONS

"First, the hypothesis that in P we have a projection of later conditions into the desert period breaks down under the weight of P's data. The writer conceives the Levites primarily as a body of sacred porters. Now nobody living in

any subsequent age could suppose that there was either occasion or possibility to carry about the Temple. If we are really to adopt the projection theory (according to which the duties of the Levites in P mirror their duties in the second Temple), we must imagine a priestly gentleman picturing to himself sections of the Temple walls and bits of the roof as being carried about at odd times by Levites on their shoulders. . . . The absurdity of this proposition must surely be obvious to everybody.

"Secondly, the net result of such a scheme would be to create a body of Levites for use *during the period of the wanderings and never thereafter*. As soon as the desert age was over, the whole tribe would find their main occupation gone. How can we conceive that any legislator deliberately sat down and invented such a scheme centuries after the epoch to which it relates, well knowing that in so far as his scheme purported to be a narrative of events it was fictitious from beginning to end, and in so far as it might be regarded as a legislation applicable to his own or any future day there was not a line in it that could conceivably be put into practice? If any theorist can be conceived as acting in this way, how are we to suppose that his work would meet with acceptance? Yet that and nothing less is what the theory demands.

"Thirdly, P neither embodies the views of Ezekiel nor finds an accurate reflection in Chronicles. The views of P are quite different from those of the other two books. The facts are such as to enable us to say definitely that P is not in line with them. It is impossible to assume that he appointed the death penalty for certain acts if performed by Levites because he really wished the Levites to perform those acts."[1]

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1910, pp. 495–496.

THE PRIESTS IN P

Careful examination of the position of the priests in P also confirms the sketch of the history given above. Take, for instance, the laws of Lev. xiii. f. "Let us test the application of these. At the very beginning of the earlier chapter we read that a man who has certain symptoms is to be brought to Aaron the priest or unto one of his sons. Then follow rules for inspecting and isolating the patient. Remembering that on the critical theory P assumes the capital at Jerusalem as self-evident, we must ask how such provisions were to work after the conquest. During the desert period nothing could have been simpler, but what was to happen when the Israelites dwelt all over Canaan from Beersheba to Dan? Nay more, how could such regulations conceivably occur to the mind of any sane man during or after the exile when the bulk of the Israelites were in Babylonia and there were important Jewish colonies in Egypt and elsewhere? And if the theory is absurd when it is applied to men, what are we to say when we read of leprous garments (Lev. xiii. 47 ff.)? Was a man to make the pilgrimage from Babylonia to Jerusalem to consult a priest about a doubtful garment? And what about the leper's offerings in chapter xiv.? Could they conceivably have been meant to apply to such circumstances?"[1]

Further details must be sought in the article to which reference has been made.

MINOR POINTS

The minor points in Wellhausen's theory need not detain us long. It is certainly true that there are passages in Judges, Samuel, and Kings on which Wellhausen relies that present difficulty when read in the Massoretic text, but it is also the

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1910, pp. 501–502.

case that the Versions often enable us to solve the difficulties with comparative ease.

The discussion is omitted at this point because it is somewhat technical, and anybody who wishes to go into the matter further can consult the *Bibliotheca Sacra* article; but it may be said generally that the LXX knew nothing of Jonathan's being a member of the tribe of Judah, or of the alleged priesthood of David's sons or Zabud, while Ira is in some of the old authorities not a Jairite, but a Jattirite, i.e. a person from the priestly city Jattir. On the other hand, there are a number of instances where Wellhausen has read into the texts meanings that they will not bear. Take the alleged priesthood of Samuel at Shiloh. Samuel was taken there when he was weaned. Weaning sometimes takes place very late in the East — when the child is as old as three. It is therefore possible that he was as much as four years old when he went to Shiloh. What priestly functions can he possibly have performed at that age? It is true that he must have grown older every day, but when we read of his mother's bringing him a little garment, we see that the whole narrative refers to his childhood. He was page, not priest. Nor again does the narrative suggest that he slept by the side of the Ark. He did sleep in the building and acted as porter: but that is quite different from sleeping next to the Ark. Again, it is not obvious why David and Solomon should not have blessed the people. Nothing could be more natural than that a king should invoke God's blessing on his subjects, and the language used shows in some instances that the blessing was *not* the priestly blessing (1 Kings viii. 55 ff.). Lastly, Ex. iv. 14 does not mean that there existed an otherwise unknown profession of Levites. "The Levite" is simply part of Aaron's full designation, as is proved by all the other passages that bear on the question.

FIRSTLINGS

Other minor questions are linked with this. Of these, the case of firstlings may be taken as an example: "Not the least of the troubles that await biblical investigators is the use of technical terms. The obscurity that has beset some of these is the main cause of the inability of biblical students to understand the law as to firstlings. Shortly stated, the main effect of the various provisions is to enact that every male firstling shall be holy, — a technical term meaning that it is to be withdrawn from ordinary use, and sacrificed, — and that these 'holy' firstlings are to be brought to the religious center. Then a due (called a 'heave-offering,' the amount of which lay in the discretion of the sacrificant, but which appears generally to have consisted of one or more of the animals) was to be paid to the priest, while the owner and his family consumed the rest at a feast. Now it happens that this has to be collected from various passages in different books of the Pentateuch. Deuteronomy — the book intended for public reading to the people — contains the command to bring the firstlings to the religious center and hold the feast. In a passage of Numbers that deals with dues, the rule as to paying a heave-offering is laid down, while a third passage dealing with the internal priestly arrangements makes provision for the disposition of the heave-offering when received. Owing chiefly to failure to understand the principles of arrangement and the technical terms employed, the commentators have thought that there was an antinomy between Deuteronomy and Numbers, while they have failed to bring the passage which really supplies the key to the whole problem (Num. v. 9–10) into relation with the other laws that treat of the subject. For detailed proof of what has been

said about firstlings, see the *Churchman* for July, 1906, pp. 426–430, and September, 1906, pp. 554, 555." [1]

THE SLAVE LAWS

The remaining legal difficulties will be found discussed in the writer's "Studies in Biblical Law" and the various articles he has contributed to the *Churchman* and the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Perhaps the most interesting case is provided by the slave laws. Moses enacted that a Hebrew slave could go out in the seventh year *after purchase,* or in the alternative could elect to stay with his master, in which case he was to remain a slave for ever. So far no difficulty arises, but we must be careful to note that the law only applies to the *purchase* of a Hebrew slave. In ancient Israel, slavery arose in many ways. There are repeated references to birth as well as purchase as a source of property in slaves (Gen. xiv. 14; xvii. 12; Ex. xxi. 4, etc.). We also meet with gift (Gen. xx. 14), capture in war (xiv. 21; xxxiv. 29), crime (xliii. 18; xliv.). In most of these cases the slaves would not be Hebrews, but they would be circumcised (Gen. xvii.), and would thereafter be regarded as such. But they would still be slaves. There are world-wide parallels to all these methods of acquiring slaves and they call for no comment. There was however yet another cause that was universal in antiquity — insolvency (Gen. xlvii. 19). In most ancient societies this led to full slavery, but in some the freeman who became insolvent remained free in the eye of the law but was compelled to serve his creditors like a slave. That may seem to be a distinction without a difference, but in Rome, for example, the differences were very important. The free bondman retained certain civic rights and duties — such as liability to fight for his city.

[1] Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1907, p. 11.

In Lev. xxv. Moses deals with such cases. His regulations have been widely misunderstood and thought to be slave laws: but when we apply to them ordinary legal methods we see that this is not so. Thus he begins "If thy brother be waxen poor, and sell himself" (ver. 39). In order to wax poor and sell himself, a man must first be free. One who was already a slave could not wax poor: still less could he sell himself. It is for this reason that it is provided that this 'brother' is not to be treated as a slave. In fact, the Hebrew freeman who became insolvent was not to become a slave. He was to serve his creditor till the year of the jubilee, when he was to return to his former status. On the other hand, the stranger who became insolvent was to become a slave in the ordinary way, the benefits of the jubilee law not being applied to him. No competent jurist who examined the original carefully without bias could come to any other conclusion as to its meaning. There is no discrepancy between the law for Hebrew slaves and the jubilee law which relates solely to insolvent Hebrew freemen.

IV

THE LITERARY ARGUMENT

So much confusion prevails as to the scope and effect of the so-called literary arguments, especially among those who are not Hebraists, that it is desirable to explain with some degree of fullness exactly what is and what is not meant. The following is an extract from an article which appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1907, in which the writer has sought to explain as clearly as he could the precise nature of this branch of the higher critical case:

"Our first task must be to enquire what is meant by the philological or literary argument. The word philology is often used to denote the science of the history of language. It is not in that sense that the higher critics generally use the term when they put forward their 'philological' argument for the documentary theory. It is necessary to dwell on this point because many readers who are not Hebraists suppose that there are philological grounds (the term 'philological' being used in the sense just indicated) for the divisive hypothesis. That is not so. Material drawn from the real or supposed history of the Hebrew language is scarcely ever put in the forefront of the critical case. . . . The following extract from the Oxford Hexateuch gives us a representative statement of the ordinary argument:

"'But it may reasonably be expected that materials of different ages, drawn from separate sources, will be marked by their own characteristics of style or expression. Peculiar turns of phrase, due to the vivacity of oral narrative, or sig-

nificant of legal precision, or repeated by the impassioned earnestness of the preacher, may be found to coincide with different groups of narrative or law already distinguished from each other by incompatibilities of content. The recurrence of these peculiarities becomes in its turn a warning; and each additional instance, in accordance with the general law of probabilities, brings far more than its own individual weight. Moreover their effect is again heightened if there is reason to believe that they can be in any way connected with other forces of thought and life. The journalist who should lightly talk of "the tendency not ourselves" or of "sweetness and light" might safely be placed with Matthew Arnold in the second half of the Victorian age. The teacher who dwelt on "the silences" and "the eternities" could not have taught before Carlyle. A cause must be found for the different philosophical vocabulary of Coleridge compared with that of Hume. The devotional utterance of Watts and Doddridge is couched in a different idiom from that of Newman and Faber. In the same way if one group of chapters which there is independent reason to assign to the seventh century, shows marked affinities of expression with Jeremiah, and another group with Ezekiel, it may be possible to explain the resemblances on the hypothesis of the indebtedness of the prophets, but the student must also consider the probability that they may be due to the influences of separate religious schools.'

"It will be seen that nothing is here said of phonetic evolution or the history of words. The argument is not philological in the narrow sense of the word. But attention is drawn to the fact that there may be differences of style; and it is suggested that in certain circumstances there may be some connection between these and other forces of thought and life. We must notice too that in this passage — which gives

us a very fair and moderate exposition of the line of argument adopted by most higher critics — several qualifications are introduced. It is first supposed that different groups of narrative or law are already distinguished by incompatibilities of content. That is to say, the writer in the first instance assigns to the stylistic argument an ancillary character. Then he very fairly admits that resemblances between Jeremiah or Ezekiel on the one hand and certain portions of the Pentateuch on the other may possibly be explained on the hypothesis of the indebtedness of the prophets: and a moment's thought will convince any impartial reader that such a view contains nothing that is improbable. If, for example, Deuteronomy — whether a genuine work of Moses or a recent literary forgery — was discovered (or rediscovered) in the time of Jeremiah, it can occasion no surprise that it should have exercised a powerful influence on his style. A further claim is however made for the argument. 'The recurrence of these peculiarities becomes in its turn a warning'; in plain English the Pentateuch is dissected in part on grounds of style." [1]

THE BIAS AND INACCURACY OF THE CRITICS

That an argument from style is necessarily very subjective must be obvious to every thinking reader. In the present case there are many considerations to be urged in reply. There are, first, the bias and the inaccuracy that are unfortunately so obvious to every impartial reader. For example, a critic will contend that the phrase "land of Egypt" is characteristic of P, but will pass over in silence the fact that it occurs in J and E. Often, too, the statements made are quite inaccurate. All the lists of words require much sifting before they can be accepted. Investigations of this nature are neces-

[1] The Princeton Theological Review, October, 1907, pp. 606–609.

sarily too detailed for the present discussion, but it is desirable that readers should note that the critical statements in this department must be taken with a grain of salt. Another striking feature is the circular reasoning that is also frequent. A passage will be assigned to a particular document on the ground that it contains a given phrase, and then this phrase will be cited as characteristic of this document. "To take an illustration: in Ex. iii. 19 we find a particular use of the infinitive. This is assigned by the editors of the new English edition of Gesenius's Hebrew lexicon to J, but by Mr. Carpenter to a redactor on the ground partly that this is an E phrase. Then this phrase is quoted in the E list of words to distinguish E from other documents."[1] It would be quite easy to cite one instance after another of reasoning of this type: but it would merely make the discussion unnecessarily tedious. Examples will be found in Dr. Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament."

THE REDACTORS

Another great argument against the critical contention is supplied by the fact that redactors must constantly be postulated to remove difficulties. For instance, as already mentioned, there are two words for bondwoman. It is then said that E uses *amah* while J employs *shifchah*. Now take such a chapter as Gen. xx.; both words occur here. What is to be done? The chapter is given to E, and accordingly the use of *amah* in verse 17 is in order: *shifchah* in verse 14, however, is certainly troublesome. Therefore a redactor is said to have introduced the phrase in this verse. When it is remembered that the main clue — the use of *Elohim* in this chapter — is disposed of by the textual evidence, the difficulties of this line of reasoning become obvious. The argument in reply

[1] Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, p. 79.

derives further strength from a fact to be noted hereafter in another connection — viz. that 'dream,' which is supposed to point to E rather than to J, is in reality a feature common to both "sources." When one distinguishing characteristic after another goes by the board, it is impossible to urge with any shadow of probability that a troublesome phrase is due to a redactor whose existence has to be assumed merely to enable the critics to claim a particular word as distinctive of a source. Indeed, the backbone of the distinction between J and E is furnished by the Divine appellations and the Joseph story. It has been shown that not the slightest reliance can be placed on the critical contentions with respect to either of these, and it is highly probable that as these facts gradually sink into the minds of the critics they will jettison the whole JE analysis.

Other causes of some of the phenomena claimed by the critics as distinctive and the answers to their arguments appear in the following paragraphs, which are transcribed from an article that appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review* for October, 1907:

STRANGENESS OF THE SELECTION OF WORDS

"First, then, their selection of words frequently causes profound amazement. Take the following from an argument in the Oxford Hexateuch as to the first seven chapters of Leviticus: 'Attention may also be called to the large group of cultus terms and formulæ, the constant repetition of which is characteristic of the legal style of P: thus, *Aaron's sons, atonement, without blemish (perfect), bring near (offer, present), burn, burn with fire, clean, guilt offering, heave offering, holy, kill, lay his hand on, meal offering, oblation, offering made by fire, sacrifice of peace offerings, etc.*' It will

be noted that all the above are technical terms or terms that are peculiarly appropriate in regulations for sacrifice at the religious capital. This is emphasized if we take the words that might appear to an English reader to be general words and follow up the remarks made about them in the Oxford Hexateuch itself. Thus on the word 'burn' we find the following: 'Ex. xxix. 13–Num. xviii. 17 (sacrificially) forty-four times,' and of 'kill' we read: 'Ex. xii. 6 and onwards, forty-two times, ritually.' The argument therefore amounts to saying that in a technical passage technical terms are used. To give it any force at all it would be necessary to prove either that 'P' would have used these terms in narrative, speeches, civil laws, etc., if he had composed the whole Pentateuch, or else that 'D' or 'JE' would not have used them in technical sacrificial regulations. It need scarcely be said that no attempt is or can be made to prove anything of the sort."

LITERARY FEELING

"A second defect in the critical work is due to the inability of its authors to appreciate the subtle motives that influence great writers. Civilians have a division of 'things' that recurs to the mind — fungible things and non-fungible things. Fungible things are those *quae pondere, numero, mensurave constant* — things that are weighed, counted, or measured, — such as money, wine, oil, corn, bronze, silver, gold. Non-fungible things are all others. For the critics words are mere fungible things. For great artists they are non-fungible. That is the secret of many phenomena that puzzle modern commentators. Eye and ear — especially ear — are needed to appreciate the choice of words; and a sense of form and an apprehension of subtle shades of meaning of which no signs are to be found in the critical work. . . . Confining ourselves

to mere single words or expressions it is impossible to give instances that would be intelligible to readers who are not Hebraists, but if we go beyond these it is easy to produce a most convincing example. There can be few English readers who have not admired the sublime opening of the book of Genesis. Here is the usual critical version: 'These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created. In the beginning, etc.' The explanation given by the Oxford Hexateuch should prove illuminating. 'It has long been recognized that the Book of Genesis is primarily based upon a document containing a series of sections introduced by the formula "These are the generations of. . . . The *toledhoth* [i.e. "generations of." H. M. W.] formula of Gen. ii. 4a is not appropriate to the narrative which follows it in ii. 4b ff., for this says nothing about the creation of the heavens or the earth, but deals with the formation of the first man after they were made. On the other hand its form and substance are both congruous with the account of the creation of the universe in i. 1–ii. 3. In other sections, however, the formula always precedes the matter which it designates. It is probable, therefore, that it originally stood before i. 1, and was transposed by the editor who combined the two documents, to serve as the link of combination.'

"So not only words, but sections and sentences are to the critics fungible things — things *quae pondere, numero, mensurave constant.* If I borrow a sovereign, I am under an obligation to pay back a sovereign — any sovereign — not necessarily the actual coin I borrow. *All* are legal tender. And similarly with the book of Genesis. If I do not begin with one sentence, I must begin with another. *All* are legal tender; and literary considerations — using the word 'literary' in its best sense — do not enter into the question. But as all

sovereigns conform to a certain type, so must all the sections of 'P' in Genesis. There is no difference between the minting of coins and the minting of sections of Genesis.

"But what if literature is not within the jurisdiction of the foot-rule? How if a commentator on a great author must be endowed with some appreciation of literary beauty, if he is to perform his task successfully?"

CRITICAL LACK OF JUDGMENT

"The next cause that falls to be noticed is the lack of judgment and the inability to weigh evidence that characterise the application of the critical tests. For the sake of brevity the first instance will be taken from Genesis, since in that book it is easy to find examples limited to a single verse. In a genealogy we read 'And Lamech lived an hundred eighty and two years, and begat a son' (Gen. v. 28). The whole of this down to 'begat' is given by the Oxford Hexateuch to 'P,' but 'a son' is assigned to 'J'—an author who with truly prophetic foresight took the unusual step of composing the end of the sentence some centuries before 'P' wrote the beginning. The reason given throws much light on the analysis. The preceding items in this genealogy all conform to the type 'And A lived *x* years and begat B.' Accordingly we read in the note: 'The uniformity of P's style leads us to expect here the name of Noah. The compiler, however, wishing apparently to utilize J's explanation of it, has inserted it at this point, having no doubt found it in the list which traced Noah's descent through Seth iv. 25 f. That pedigree has apparently been rejected by the editor in favour of the more highly systematized scheme of P, etc.' In other words 'P' could not have written 'a son' in vs. 28 because he has not done so in other verses, and we can feel the ge-

nius of fungible things — things *quae pondere, numero, mensurave constant* — hovering over us. It would be interesting to know what course was open to 'P' if he too desired to give an explanation of Noah's name. Are the premises in any way commensurate to the conclusion? Would it not be easier to suppose that 'P' could vary his language when occasion demanded than to postulate this extraordinary machinery of lists and compilers?"[1]

THE EFFECT OF GLOSSES ON STYLE

It is necessary at this point to remind the reader of another cause to which reference has already been made — the activity of glossators. When we find a text in some ancient Version that is identical with our present Hebrew in sense but obviously goes back to an original that was shorter in the number of words employed, we naturally ask which is the nearer to the author's composition? Very often the balance of probability is in favor of the shorter text, the additional words being mere explanatory notes by later annotators. It is just these words that swell the extraordinary lists of the higher critics, which would bear a very different appearance if due attention had first been given to a thorough and scientific sifting of the available textual material.

Yet when all allowances have been made for the causes indicated above there remains a residuum of argument and this is due to other reasons.

STYLE NOT NECESSARILY A CRITERION OF AUTHORSHIP

"The critical case rests on the assumption that differences of style prove differences of authorship. What has the comparative method to teach us as to this premiss? Does it confirm its soundness? The answer — which sweeps away the

[1] The Princeton Theological Review, October, 1907, pp. 613–617.

foundations of the critical argument — is in the negative. There is a passage in Norden's *Kunstprosa* — not to be translated for fear of losing the flavour of the original — in which the author asks what influence the individuality of the writer had on his style in the ancient world, or, in other words, how far Buffon's *le style est l'homme même* holds good for that period. Norden concludes that style was an acquired art, that individuality was subordinated in a far higher degree than to-day, and that one and the same writer could write in different styles according to the task in hand. The case of Moses is to some extent different from that of any classical writer. He could have had stylistic models only within very narrow limits. A few traditions, a few songs and poems, a few 'dooms' pronounced by the elders, would have constituted the sum total of the Hebrew literature that he found. Nevertheless I see no difficulty in supposing that when occasion demanded he was capable of creating a style suitable for the matter in hand. After all, the purposes of the various portions of the Pentateuchal legislation are palpably diverse. While the judgments are written in a form suitable for memorising (which may have conformed to what was usual in the traditional 'dooms' pronounced by the courts of elders) — it is obvious that no speech could have been composed in the same style. Here, then, necessity must have been the mother of invention. And in dealing with the third style — that of the great body of 'priestly' legislation — it must be remembered that the purpose was again different. Here we are not dealing either with a speech or with dooms to be committed to memory, but with complicated and technical rules to be transmitted by a specially trained class who would teach the people. It is possible to point to modern instances of similar versatility. Let the Indian Penal Code

which was drafted by Macaulay be contrasted with the speeches and ballads of the same writer and similar divergencies of vocabulary and rhythm will at once become apparent. If it be urged that Macaulay came after a period of long literary development, I answer (1) that it is impossible to lay down narrow rules which no genius can transcend, and (2) that no man, however gifted, could have written 'dooms' and speeches in the same vocabulary and rhythm and made a success of both. A man of genius who found himself confronted with such very different tasks could not avoid creating the means of executing them. In a word, I conceive that in each case the style was merely a tool forged by Moses for the accomplishment of his purpose." [1]

[1] **The Princeton Theological Review, October, 1907, pp. 622–624.**

V

HIGHER CRITICAL ARGUMENTS AND POSITIONS THAT ARE DUE TO PURELY SUBJECTIVE CAUSES

HITHERTO the discussion has been concerned with topics where the Hebrew text or the traditional explanations of the laws did in fact appear to present some real difficulty or at least some justification for the contention of critics who had no special training and no qualifications for literary criticism. We have now to draw attention to an entirely different class of cases. There are a vast number of expressions in the text that cause endless difficulty to the higher critics, not by virtue of any intrinsic quality, but because of the frame of mind in which the commentators approach them. Probably it will be best to illustrate this at some length with a very simple case. The following is extracted from the writer's "Notes on Hebrew Religion." "The LORD" stands for the different transliterations of the Tetragrammaton adopted by the various authors cited:

THE ARK IN NUMBERS X

"I now come to a group of questions that may be most suitably discussed in dealing with a few verses of Numbers. We are told in x. 33 that 'the Ark of the covenant of the LORD went before them' (i.e. the Israelites). It would seem to most people that no doubt could arise as to the meaning of this phrase, but such a belief would only show ignorance of the Higher Criticism. Dr. George Buchanan Gray, who has published an edition of Numbers, writes as follows:—

"'As here, so in Josh. iii. 3 *et seq.* (D), the ark precedes the Israelites, and acts as their guide along an unknown route; but there it is borne by "the priests, the Levites." Here, if we may judge from so fragmentary a record, it is conceived of as moving by itself (cf. 1 Sam. v. *et seq.*. especially v. 11; vi. 9 *et seq.;* 2 Sam. vi. 5). The pillar of cloud is certainly thought to move of itself (e.g. Ex. xiii. 21 *et seq.*) [p. 95].

"But this is not all; Num. x. 35, 36, run as follows:

"'And it came to pass when the ark set forward, that Moses said, Arise, O LORD, and let thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate thee flee before thee. And when it rested, he said, Return, O LORD, to the myriads of the thousands of Israel.'"

"Dr. Gray writes on this:—

"'Here, as in verse 33, the ark starts of itself, and the words which follow may be taken as addressed to it. The ark is the visible form in or by which the LORD manifests his presence, and may therefore, like the angel of the LORD, be addressed as the LORD.'"[1]

CRITICISM OF DR. GRAY'S VIEW

"These notes inevitably suggest the following questions:

"1. If any reader of a modern history found the words 'the guns were ordered to the front,' would he judge that the guns were conceived of as hearing, obeying, and moving by themselves?

"2. Would he in such a case crave in aid a passage stating that clouds were seen to move across the heavens?

"3. If further he read, 'when the guns moved to the

[1] P. 96. In this and all the other excerpts from the higher critical publications I have substituted "the LORD" for their transliterations of the Tetragrammaton.

front, the band played "God save the King," ' would he infer that the guns started of themselves, and that they were 'the visible form in or by which' the King manifested his presence, and might, therefore, be addressed as the King?

"4. Has Dr. Gray — or, so far as he knows, any member of his school — attempted to check any of these statements by examining the other passages attributed to the same source in the light of these theories? Such a verse as Deut. xxxi. 15 (assigned by Mr. Addis to the same source, J) would appear to distinctly negative the theory. And did God manifest His presence by means of the Ark on other occasions? Did the Ark wander in the garden of Eden or speak from Sinai? Or is this the conception that pervades the Song of Deborah, which Dr. Gray would probably reckon among the earliest extant portions of Hebrew literature?"

DR. KAUTZSCH'S VIEW

"Professor Kautzsch, another member of this school, writes as follows: 'The LORD and the Ark, that is to say, appear here [i.e. in Num. x. 35 *et seq.* — H. M. W.] as practically identical. Not as though this wooden chest represented the LORD. But His presence appeared inseparably connected with the Ark; wherever it was seen, there the LORD was, and showed Himself active.'[1] Then he proceeds to misunderstand a number of other passages. But as he thinks these verses probably belong to J, the question inevitably arises whether he has troubled to consider how (if at all) the assertion that God's 'presence appeared inseparably connected with the Ark' can be brought into harmony with the other passages attributed to that source. But perhaps he would prefer to revert to an earlier opinion which he has

[1] Hastings' Dict. Bible, Ext. vol. p. 628 b.

expressed in another work — viz., that these verses are more ancient than the rest of J. This view rests on nothing more substantial than the averment that 'the great antiquity of this verse is clearly seen from the manner in which the holy ark is spoken of as a pledge, not to say a representation, of the personal presence of the LORD.' Fortunately, there are a few other passages which Kautzsch assigns to the same period, among them Ex. xvii. 6 and the Song of Deborah (Jud. v. 2 ff.). Does he seriously believe that in either of these passages God's presence is 'inseparably' connected with the ark? Is it of 'this wooden chest' that he writes in dealing with the Song: 'In His awful Majesty He left Mount Sinai, His holy dwelling place, to appear in person on the field of battle (ver. 4 *et seq.*) and His curse deservedly falls upon the city (ver. 23), which 'came not to the help of the Lord amongst the mighty" — 'the Lord who is the champion of His people'?"

DR. KUENEN'S VIEW

"Dr. Kuenen wrote of Num. x. 35, 36, that in this passage it was 'as plain as possible' that the Ark was regarded as 'the abode' of the LORD. That was on p. 258 of Vol. I. of the English translation of the 'Religion of Israel.' But by p. 314 he had persuaded himself that in the Song of Deborah — which, as already stated, is regarded by the critics as one of the earliest documents we possess — Seir, the land of Edom, had become His 'former and proper abode.' What was the relation of Seir and the ark?"

MR. ADDIS'S VIEW

"But the matter becomes even more complicated when we come to Mr. Addis. He has yet a third fixed abode for God. According to this view, He 'was, so far back as our knowl-

edge goes, the God of Sinai or Horeb.' Half a dozen pages later Mr. Addis finds himself involved in a difficulty. 'How,' he very pertinently asks — 'how was a God who had a fixed abode on Horeb to fight for His people when they were at a distance?' He gives three answers. He thinks that God sometimes 'left the mountain and went in person to the help of His people: this, as has been said, is the belief expressed in Deborah's song.' We may remark that the song deals with Seir, not Horeb, so that this explanation only involves fresh difficulties. Secondly, Mr. Addis says that, 'according to an old section in the Pentateuch (Ex. xxiii. 20),' God 'sent His angel to lead them on their way.' But this, unhappily, conflicts with the third explanation. According to this last theory, the Ark 'secured the presence' of God. 'There, as nowhere else, the LORD was present.' But, then, what about all the other 'fixed abodes,' at which, apparently, God must have been less present? And what need for God to leave Sinai, or for the angel of the LORD to replace Him, if in fact He was already present 'as nowhere else'?"[1]

THE MENTAL ATMOSPHERE OF THE CRITICS

This case has been dwelt on at some length, in order that some idea may be given of the mental atmosphere in which Old Testament studies are now enveloped. It is in no wise exceptional: on the contrary, instances can be given from almost any publication of the Wellhausen school. The present writer has often drawn attention to such cases in his various publications. Here are a few modern theories: "Rock of Israel" points to stone worship! The Hebrew for Aaron is *Aharon,* the Hebrew for Ark is *aron:* the difference is similar to the difference between Abraham and Abram: therefore Aaron was never a real person, but a mere personification

[1] **Notes on Hebrew Religion, pp. 28–31.**

of the Ark! There was calf-worship at Bethel: Aaron is associated with the golden calf: therefore, the priests of Bethel were descended from Aaron! Mr. Addis writes: "The terror of Isaac was a title of the deity who dwelt at Mizpah, or perhaps at Beersheba." Yet he himself translates Gen. xxxi. 42: "Unless the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the awful God of Isaac, had been with me [where? at Mizpah or at Beersheba?], surely now thou hadst sent me away empty. God has seen my affliction, and the labour of my hands, and gave His decision last night." Perhaps the following instance from the writer's "Notes on Hebrew Religion" may be of interest: "Mr. Addis puts forward what are admittedly a number of guesses — and are properly marked as such — as to the meaning of the various mourning customs. These culminate in the following: 'Even the wailing acquires a new import, when we learn that the Arabs cried to the spirit of the dead, "Be not far off."' One is irresistibly tempted to ask Mr. Addis whether the wailing of English babies also acquired a new import for the author of this suggestion when he learnt Arabic. If an English boy were found weeping, would it be reasonable to infer that he was imploring some spirit — perhaps the spirit of the birch — not to be far off? And would anybody reason from this that the English of to-day are addicted to tree-worship? It all looks absurd enough when the methods of the Wellhausen school are applied to a civilization we know intimately; but why is it less absurd when they choose ancient Israel as the background of their theories?"[1]

DREAMS AND ANGELS AS CRITERIA OF "SOURCES"

It will be seen that from this condition of affairs it must inevitably result that many arguments should be put forward

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 10 f.

in favor of the division of the Pentateuch that would never obtain the support of any man of ordinary sanity and judgment who took the trouble to investigate the phenomena for himself. For example, it is alleged that E is characterized by the occurrence of dreams. Yet in Gen. xv., verses 3 f., 17 f., forming parts of the narrative of the vision, go to J; in Gen. xxviii., Jacob goes to sleep in E and wakes in J; Pharaoh's dreams were common to both sources; in xxvi. 24 Isaac has a vision in J. Similarly with angels. These are also said to be characteristic of E, yet the angel of the LORD appears to Hagar in J (xvi. 7 ff.), two angels are prominent in xix. (J); in xxii. 15 ff. the angel of the LORD appears to Abraham, and the critics get out of the difficulty only partially, and then only by calling in "redactors" to take over passages that would have been assigned to J but for the existence of this criterion.

THE DOUBLETS

Similarly with the doublets. Here are a couple of instances. "At present the Pentateuch contains two narratives in which Moses draws water from a rock, Ex. xvii. and Num. xx. The critics hold it to be improbable that any author should have told two such stories and therefore proceed to apply their curious methods. The result is startling. In place of one author who writes two such narratives, we double the number and get two (J and E). 'J's traditions,' writes Mr. Carpenter, 'attached parallel incidents to two names, Massah and Meribah. E appears also to have contained explanations of both designations.' In addition, P had a Meribah story. So that we reach the results that when the higher critics desire to divide two by two, their arithmetical labors lead them to believe that the quotient is five — or perhaps six if P had

a Rephidim story!"[1] Thus do our literary homoeopathists remedy the improbability of having an author, who could relate two incidents of lack of water. *Similia similibus curantur!*

The case is not dissimilar with regard to manna. Num. xi. 4–6 clearly implies that the Israelites had been fed with manna for a lengthy period. "Accordingly it becomes necessary to postulate an earlier reference to manna in JE to make up for the loss of Ex. xvi., most of which has gone to P. If with Mr. Carpenter Ex. xvi. be given to E while the present passage is assigned to J, we shall have at least four manna stories, viz. J two (Num. xi. and its antecedent in the same document); E one (Ex. xvi. 4 and its original context); P one (Ex. xvi., except ver. 4). Moreover, E and P inserted their manna stories at precisely the same point in the narrative, and J's first manna story, being long before Kibroth-hattaavah, must also have come soon after the Exodus."[2]

It is true that there are two flights of quails; but, as they took place almost exactly a year apart, and as the migration of the quails is in fact annual, there is no reason at all to doubt the narrative. Other alleged doublets are examined in Dr. Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament."

THE CASE OF ARAM-NAHARAIM

Another example of the way in which difficulties are found where none exist in the text provided it be allowed to speak for itself, is afforded by the following, which is taken from an article by the writer in the *Churchman* for February, 1908.

"It is, of course, quite easy to write that, 'whatever others may do, the student of history cannot hesitate to accept

[1] Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, pp 104 f., slightly modified to meet a criticism of Dr. Toy's.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

the results which have been obtained by the very same inductive methods which have achieved such great triumphs in other regions of study'; but the answer is not far to seek. Whatever others may do, the real student of history will not accept any results without first testing all things, and searching tests applied by competent investigators have a strange knack of turning the critical case inside out. To take an illustration: A whole group of difficulties is due to the persistence of the higher critics in locating Aram-naharaim and the group of words that go with it (Haran, Paddan-aram, etc.) in Mesopotamia, while the Bible repeatedly proves that the references are to the Damascus region. It would occupy too much space to collect all the evidence; but here are some of the main points. Laban, hearing on the *third* day that Jacob had fled, reached him *in the mountain of Gilead* after seven days' journey (Gen. xxxi. 21–23). Obviously he had not come from Mesopotamia, since the time is wholly insufficient. This has been felt by the critics, and has led to some curious results. Instead of saying, 'Are we right in identifying Aram-naharaim, etc., with Mesopotamia, and holding that the "River" always means the Euphrates,' they assume that they must be right in their identifications, and that all difficulties resulting therefrom are due either to the ignorance of the Biblical writers — who are assumed to have been quite unfamiliar with the geography of their own times — or else to a plurality of sources. Accordingly, on Gen. xxxi. 21 ('and he rose up, and passed over the River') the annotator in the Oxford Hexateuch writes as follows: 'As the distance from the Euphrates to Gilead is much more than a seven days' march (23), and the extant passages of "E" do not assign Laban's home to Haran, it is possible that "E" placed it nearer to Gilead, and that the clause "and he rose up, and

passed over the River" is incorporated by the compiler from J (cp. Dillmann, who suggests as an alternative that "the River" denotes some other stream. But this is less probable than that the narrator underestimated the required time).'"

LABAN'S HOME IN SYRIA

"If the evidence be collated it becomes apparent that in 'E' Laban's home is near by, for the erection of heap and pillar in the mountain (51–54) as a *boundary* could have no meaning if Laban came from Mesopotamia, nor is it clear — unless on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle — why 'E' should call Laban 'the Syrian' (20, 24) if he came from Mesopotamia. But it is interesting to notice the thoroughly characteristic method of dealing with the matter. It is 'less probable' that the narrator knew what he was talking about than that he wrote what was geographically absurd, and it is 'possible' that the reference to the River was incorporated by the compiler from 'J.' Unfortunately, 'J' also knows the story of the heap erected at Gilead, so that he cannot have been thinking of Mesopotamia either. Moreover, he locates Laban's home in Aram-naharaim (Gen. xxiv.), and the passages we have yet to consider help us further."

BALAAM'S HOME

"The next difficulty is more serious. Balaam is lodged by Deuteronomy in Aram-naharaim (xxiii. 4 (5)), and by Numbers (xxiii. 7) in Aram, which normally means Syria. This gives us the equation Aram-naharaim = Aram = Syria, and greatly relieves the chronology of the concluding chapters of Numbers, which on the higher critical hypothesis is impossible. Dr. G. B. Gray actually goes the length of writing, 'A journey to Aram-naharaim, related elsewhere, was undertaken with camels (Gen. xxiv. 10); the ass of Num. xxii., verses 22–

34, belongs to a story which locates Balaam's home much nearer Moab.' But surely, then, even the ass testifies to the error of identifying the Aram of Num. xxiii. 7 and the Aram-naharaim of Deuteronomy and Genesis with Mesopotamia. There is no difficulty in explaining the use of the camels in the circumstances narrated by Genesis, if Aram-naharaim means the Damascus region, but the Mesopotamian theory is in conflict alike with the ass, the chronological data, the statements of Genesis as to Laban, and the ordinary meaning of Aram. But even that is not all; yet another of the Biblical writers insists on identifying Aram-naharaim with the Damascus district. The title to Ps. lx. referring to the narration of 2 Sam. viii. speaks of Aram-naharaim and Aram-zobah. This corresponds to Zobah and *Damascus* in the text of Samuel." [1]

ANOTHER INSTANCE

Other criteria for the dissection of the Pentateuch are provided by the division itself. A curious instance is afforded by the higher critical allegation that one narrative places the Israelites apart in Goshen while two others know nothing of Goshen and locate them among the Egyptians. Any reader who wishes to test the critics for himself may be recommended to read the passages that deal with the Israelites under Pharaoh and see what sort of a division he can make on this basis. When he has done his best, he can then see the arguments for and against this dissection set out in the writer's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." He will be able to judge of the merits of the higher criticism none the worse for having tried it in this way for himself without being told first either how the division is effected or how it is disproved.

[1] **The Churchman, February, 1908, pp. 90–92.**

SYMPATHY WITH EASTERN IDEAS NECESSARY

An inherent lack of sympathy with Eastern methods of thought and expression is another great cause of error. The following extracts from an article entitled "Deuteronomy in Eastern Light," from the pen of Dr. G. E. White, a resident in Asia Minor, may be of interest in this connection. The article was published in the *Churchman* for November, 1909.

"The standpoint of Deuteronomy is Oriental; the standpoint of Professor Driver seems to be Occidental. The two angles of vision are not greatly apart, but, if I am not mistaken, there is some real difference. . . . Professor Driver mentions it as a variation not favorable to Moses' authorship that 'in i. 9–13 the plan of appointing judges to assist Moses is represented as originating with Moses himself,' whereas 'in Ex. xviii. 13–26 the plan is referred entirely to the advice of Jethro.' I cannot tell what use of language is allowed or disallowed in England in such a case, but I know that in Turkey the same act or idea may be attributed, for example, to the King, a Councillor of State, a Viceroy, or even a local Governor, according to the connection and with no thought of a contradiction." [1]

Similarly, when Dr. Driver finds a discrepancy between Deut. i. 22 f. and Num. xiii. 1–3, because in the one passage the mission of the spies is referred to a suggestion of the people and in the other to a command of God, Dr. White makes the following convincing reply: "This is still a common mode of speech in the East. To illustrate, the constitutional régime proclaimed in July, 1908, has been referred in common speech about equally to Allah and to the Young Turks, and no one supposes that, in recognising the agency

[1] The Churchman, November, 1909, p. 826.

of the one even in an exclusive form of words, he is debarred from recognising the other." One more quotation from this article: "In reviewing a series of events, in describing a complicated process or a scene with several actors, they frequently disregard the strict sequence of events, and group their actors somewhat like the figures in a picture deficient in perspective. This is unsatisfactory to the Occidental sense of order and proportion; but if one is to understand Oriental utterance to the full, he must strive to put himself *en rapport* with the speaker. He is not justified in demanding from his Eastern friend what the latter never professed to give." [1]

IGNORANCE OF HUMAN NATURE

This ignorance of Eastern methods of thought is often reinforced by a most exhaustive ignorance of human nature, which causes the critics to find difficulties where none exist. Dr. Driver, for example, believes that Deuteronomy must have known a different account from Numbers of the reason for Moses being excluded from the promised land, on the ground that, in Deut. i. 37, 38; the ground of the prohibition was God's anger with him *on account of the people.* A very little acquaintance with human nature would have saved him from this trap.

ANOTHER SUBJECTIVE CAUSE

In his "Problem of the Old Testament," Dr. Orr has collected a very large number of examples of subjective criticism. This book has (at any rate in England) been issued at a price that puts it within the reach of all, and it is not the present writer's desire to duplicate Dr. Orr's arguments unnecessarily. A single example may, however, be quoted: "As little are we disposed to trust the critic's 'feeling' for an

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 827.

'Ephraimitic tinge' in E, when we find, *e.g.*, one authority on this 'tinge' (Kautzsch) declaring that 'it [E] no longer conveys the impression of a triumphant outlook on a glorious future, but rather that of a retrospect on a bygone history, in which were many gloomy experiences;' and another (Kittel) assuring us that 'the whole tone of E bears witness to a certain satisfaction of the national consciousness, and joy over what has been won.'" [1]

WHAT THE CRITICS BELIEVE

And now that we have examined the main classes of argument adopted by the higher critics in support of the analysis, it may be well to take some instances of what they believe on the strength of such reasoning. We have already had some examples — and those not the least striking — in our consideration of the appellations of God. Those now to be given are selected for their shortness, and in each case the division is that adopted in the Oxford Hexateuch. In Gen. x., 1b ("And unto them were sons born after the flood") is wrenched from the context (P), and given to J; verses 20, 22, and 23 are taken from J — to whom the context belongs — for the enrichment of P. In Gen. xii., verse 9 "may be due to the compiler who has attached the Egyptian episode 10–20 by its means." In xiii., verse 1 "may be really" the harmonist's; verse 2 belongs to J; verses 3 and 4 constitute "the editorial connexion of xii. 10–xiii. 1 with the account of Lot's choice"; verse 5 goes to J; of verse 6a, we read "P summarizes the incident, in his usual method in cases which he does not select for expansion." Then the narrative returns to J. If we ask where there is any proof of all this, none is offered to us. The documentary theory is not so much the

[1] Problem of the Old Testament, pp. 210 f.

result of the difficulties of the Massoretic text, as of the mentality of the critics. There is a phase of mind to which anything, however preposterous, becomes credible, and it is this condition which is responsible for the Higher Criticism in the form in which we know it to-day.

CRITICAL DISAGREEMENT

It should be added that the higher critical frame of mind leads to different results in different individuals. The critics never have agreed among themselves, and are never likely to. Recently, in the year 1908, Professor Eerdmans, Kuenen's successor in the University of Leyden, published the first two volumes of a series in which he renounces his allegiance to Astruc, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, and puts forward a fresh higher critical theory of his own. They have been followed by a third on the same lines. Notices of these volumes will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1909, and July, 1910. Here it is sufficient to say that they mark an absolute break with most of what has hitherto been esteemed as the highest wisdom in higher critical circles, and are more interesting on that account than for any intrinsic merit.

Those who may desire to go further into the higher critical analysis and the reasons for it will find the necessary materials in the publications of Professors Orr and Green and of the present writer. It is necessary now to say a few words about another portion of the higher critical case — the dating.

VI

THE SIGNS OF POST-MOSAIC DATE

THE passages alleged to prove post-Mosaic date are not the part of the higher critical case on which the critics themselves place most reliance. Thus Dr. Driver, in his book on Genesis, after pointing to the texts that he regards as post-Mosaic, writes: "But these are isolated passages, the inferences naturally authorized by which might not impossibly be neutralized by the supposition that they were later additions to the original narrative, and did not consequently determine by themselves the date of the book as a whole. The question of the date of the Book of Genesis is really part of a wider question, viz. that of the date of the Pentateuch, — or rather Hexateuch, — as a whole. . . . It must suffice . . . . here to say generally, that when the different parts of the Hexateuch, especially the Laws, are compared together, and also compared with the other historical books of the Old Testament, and the prophets, it appears clearly that they cannot all be the work of a single man, or the product of a single age: the different strata of narrative and law into which, when closely examined, the Hexateuch is seen to fall, reveal differences of such a kind that they can only be adequately accounted for by the supposition that they reflect the ideas and embody the institutions, which were characteristic of widely different periods of Israelitish history." [1]

Thus it will be seen that Dr. Driver relies primarily on the arguments that we have already refuted and admits that little

[1] **The Book of Genesis, pp. xv–xvi.**

weight should be attached to the post-Mosaica. In point of fact these mostly break down under examination. The most interesting is Gen. xxii., which, in the form known to the Massoretic Text, appears to refer to the Temple Hill — Mount Moriah — as the Mount of the LORD. But, as already pointed out,[1] there is an alternative vocalization of the Hebrew text of verse 14 followed by the LXX according to which the proverb ran, "In the Mount the LORD was seen." The thought that God manifested his power especially in mountains would then be parallel to the view of the Syrians in 1 Kings xx. 23, 28, who alleged that He was a God of the mountains. There may well have been a proverb to that effect, and it is easy to understand that the Hebrew was wrongly read at a later date by men who thought the original reading of the expression anthropomorphic and therefore preferred the alternative. As to "the land of Moriah" in verse 2, the Versions are all at variance. The most probable reading is that of the Syriac which has "land of the Amorite." This shows how easily post-Mosaic touches could be introduced into the early narrative by the causes that operate on every MS. text. An examination of the other post-Mosaica of Genesis will be found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1911. A number of other post-Mosaica are considered in "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" (pp. 171 ff.) and the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April, 1910, and it is hoped to deal with yet others in future issues of the same Review. Speaking generally, it may be said that the broad result of a candid and critical examination of such phenomena is to show that in the course of centuries the Hebrew text has undergone some slight corruptions and has also been enriched with various notes by subsequent commentators.

[1] *Supra*, p. 19.

These notes often contain information that is valuable in itself and do not affect the question of the authorship of the main body of the narrative. In most cases the higher critics have themselves recognized that they are not integral portions of the original documents, and do not assign them to J or E or D or P, but regard them as what they are — glosses. Hence they are of little importance for our present purpose.

VII

THE MORAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ISSUES

Before leaving the higher critical case for the constructive proof of the conservative position, we must glance at certain extraordinary features of the theory taken as a whole.

THE LEGISLATION PROFESSEDLY MOSAIC

In the first place, the whole mass of the Pentateuchal legislation undoubtedly professes to be Mosaic. How do the critics meet this? They allege that there was a custom in Israel of attributing all laws to Moses, they cite Hindu parallels, they say that "and the Lord spake unto Moses" means nothing more than "Be it enacted that." Let us consider these allegations in detail. It is absolutely untrue that such a custom existed in Israel. When Ezekiel puts forward his legislation he does so in his own name. He makes no pretense that it was Mosaic. When Samuel institutes a law of the kingdom, or David introduces a rule as to the distribution of booty, they act in their own names. The Chronicler repeatedly ascribes various institutions to David. Nowhere is there a trace of the alleged custom. The Hindus, again, are noted as literary forgers, and it will be time enough to consider their practice when they produce an ethical religion that is comparable to that of the Old Testament. As to the theory that the evidence of the legislation can be disposed of by a statement that "and the Lord spake unto Moses" are merely enacting words, the whole texture of the laws contradicts this hypothesis. Open them at random anywhere, and you will find innumerable phrases that point to the Mo-

saic age and no other: — "Tent of Meeting," "Wilderness," "Camp," "When ye pass over Jordan into the land of Canaan," etc. There is, therefore, no doubt as to what the laws profess to be.

THE DECALOGUE AND DEUTERONOMY

This, then, opens up a number of inquiries. The moral question cannot be evaded. What is the position of a man who alleges that God spoke certain words at Sinai if he in fact knows that he has himself composed the alleged utterance? And what shall we say of the huge psychological improbability that a person who was capable of acting in such a way should produce a Decalogue of such lofty spiritual and ethical content? *Nemo repente fit turpissimus,* says the old maxim of the law of evidence, and it is nothing short of an impossibility that the Decalogue should proceed from a literary forger. And what about the people to whom he published this novel statement? Is it really credible that they should accept it without demur? Would nobody be found to wonder that this was the first that had been heard about so unparalleled an occurrence? Is it conceivable that such a narrative as that of the event at Sinai could be made part of a nation's consciousness by a few strokes of a forger's pen? The case is no better with Deuteronomy. In the days of Josiah there were prophets living — men like Jeremiah who thundered against those who prophesied falsely in the Name of the LORD. Can it really be suggested that in that epoch nobody was capable of discriminating between truth and falsehood, or that nobody knew better?

THE PRIESTLY CODE

If anything, the case is a little stronger with the Priestly Code. It must be remembered that in the critical theory

many of its institutions had never existed at all in history, but were mere exilic inventions. What can be said of the ethics of those who forged it or of the intelligence of those who accepted it? Can it be believed, for example, that when for the first time a law was read assigning to the Levites forty-eight cities from the Mosaic period onwards, nobody, whether Levite or common Israelite, wondered that this was the first that had been heard of the matter? It matters not which way we turn: the theory is loaded with historical and psychological incredibilities of the first order. It reeks of the lamp. In real life such things do not happen.

VIII

THE THEORY OF A HEXATEUCH

It is perhaps desirable to deal very shortly with the theory that we should speak of a Hexateuch, not a Pentateuch. The Hebrew Canon puts the Law in a separate category from any other book. The Samaritans adopted the Law alone as canonical, not the book of Joshua. The two works present different orthographical peculiarities that are most unfavorable to unity of origin. The critics themselves cannot agree whether all the Pentateuchal sources are to be found in the book of Joshua or not, and are widely at variance with one another as to the analysis. In any case they are compelled to say that if these sources are all present, their relative positions are entirely changed — P no longer supplying the framework — and they are quite differently worked up. To all this must be added the evidence as to the date and authorship of the Pentateuch that will be considered later. In the circumstances the Hexateuch theory need not detain us.

IX

THE CONSTRUCTIVE CASE FOR UNITY

To a great extent the unity of the Pentateuch is best proved by the failure and the defeat of all the attempts at dismemberment. For a century and a half the higher critics have labored to divide the book into its constituent documents. What is the result? An analysis that has been abandoned by the most recent of the higher critical inquirers, that fails to explain the phenomena, that undergoes perpetual modifications at the hands of its supporters, that nobody dare defend when it is challenged in its most vital portions. There are chapters on which even the members of the dominant school have never been able to agree, such as Num. xxxii. There has been a perpetual tendency to resolve the documents into smaller fragments — J, E, etc., being converted into the work of schools J_1, J_2, etc., and E_1, E_2, etc. This tendency is virtually a confession of the failure of the analytic method to solve the difficulties. There has been no attempt to meet the present writer's repeated challenges even on such all-important issues as the validity of Astruc's clue, which has guided the work of the higher critics for a century and a half, or Wellhausen's inability to distinguish between a mound and a house, which is mainly responsible for the current historical reconstructions. Archæologists, and those who have been influenced by archæological results, have abandoned the theory in increasing numbers. These and similar facts supply the best argument for the unity of the Pentateuch.

SIGNS OF UNITY

It must not, however, be supposed that there are no other arguments available. On the contrary, it constantly happens that evidence of one sort or another exists to prove the unity of what the critics sunder. At the same time much of this evidence is evaded by various hypotheses. For example, seventy is a sacred number, and it appears that the original text of Gen. x. contained seventy names, though the Hebrew now presents rather more. Such a fact is obviously due to design; but whose design? The critics attribute it to the redactor. Similarly with the systematic framework of the book of Genesis. That is given to P, and it is then stated that the redactor took this as his basis and fitted into it excerpts from JE. It is the same in all cases where various documents dovetail in such a way as to make a single narrative. Instead of saying "Here is a natural and intelligible account which is obviously a unity," the critics often divide it between two sources, alleging that the missing parts of one contained just the same information as is to be found in the extant parts of the other. However improbable this may appear, it is not as a rule possible to produce any reason that will convince the critics. Yet any impartial person will feel no doubt when he examines the analysis.

GENESIS XXIX.–XXXIII

To show this, the portions of Gen. xxix.–xxxiii. that are assigned to P are here transcribed in full consecutively:—

Gen. xxix. 24. "And Laban gave Zilpah his handmaid unto his daughter Leah for an handmaid."

Gen. xxix. 28b. "And he gave him Rachel his daughter to wife." Ver. 29. "And Laban gave to Rachel his daughter Bilhah his handmaid to be her handmaid."

Gen. xxx. 21. "And afterwards she bare a daughter, and called her name Dinah [this is thought by some to belong to one of the latest editors]." Ver. 22a. "And God remembered Rachel."

Gen. xxxi. 18b. "And all his substance which he had gathered, the cattle of his getting, which he had gathered in Paddan-aram, for to go to Isaac his father unto the land of Canaan."

Gen. xxxiii. 18b. "....to the city of Shechem, which is in the land of Canaan, when he came from Paddan-aram."

That is P's extant narrative for these chapters. Incidentally it shows how untrue is the statement that P forms a nearly complete whole. It must have recounted the marriage with Leah; otherwise the notice of the gift of Zilpah would have been unintelligible. As it tells us that God remembered Rachel, perhaps also of the birth of Dinah — it must have recounted the birth of Jacob's sons. That is to say, it must have had the substance of the JE portions of chapters xxix. and xxx. But, further, JE has the narratives of the birth of the sons which involves the gift of Zilpah and Bilhah, and subsequently speaks of Dinah, so that it must have narrated her birth too. Thus, by a marvelous coincidence, the missing parts of JE contained precisely the information that is contained in the extant portions of P. Similar considerations apply in the other chapters. Why were the missing portions of JE cut out and replaced by these fragments of P? What conceivable motive could the redactor have had for his conduct? Is the theory credible?

NUMBERS XVI.

But it is possible occasionally to go even further in showing the unity of the narrative. Thus there may be literary marks. For instance, in angry dialogues the speakers are

apt to catch up one another's phrases and hurl them back, and great authors often adopt this device to mark rising anger. An instance — obscured in the English Versions — occurs in Num. xvi. The rebels say, "Ye take too much upon you," verse 3 (P). This is caught up by Moses in verse 7 (P). Then, in turn Moses uses the phrase "Is it a small thing," verse 9 (a late stratum of P), and this is caught up in 13 (J). Here the marks of literary unity could not escape any true literary critic, and amply prove the impossibility of the analysis.

THE CHARACTERS UNITARY

A further and a very important mark of unity is to be found in the presentation of the various personages. Abraham, Jacob, Laban, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, to a lesser extent Isaac, have well-marked characters, and the pictures are not composite but unitary. It cannot be seriously suggested, for instance, that Abraham or Laban has one set of traits in J and another in E. The delineations are always the same: and the result is that every Bible reader is familiar with particular characters, and never dreams that he is confronted with two or more conflicting documents in each of these cases. In this respect all the "sources" show exactly the same pattern — so completely that nobody ever conceives that there could be different designs in what is so palpably an integral whole. Who has heard of two Jacobs or two Josephs? Why, even the higher critics themselves write sketches of their characters without suggesting that there is any traceable discrepancy!

X

THE EVIDENCE FOR MOSAIC DATE

Internal Evidence

The four concluding books of the Pentateuch contain innumerable proofs of the date at which they were composed. In the first instance, something may perhaps be said of the historical situation revealed by a study of the books. Thus the late Professor W. H. Green wrote as follows of Deuteronomy:—

PROFESSOR GREEN ON DEUTERONOMY

"Laws are never issued to regulate a state of things which has passed away ages before, and can by no possibility be revived. What are we to think, then, of a hypothesis which assigns the code of Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, or shortly before it, when its injunction to exterminate the Canaanites (xx. 16–18) and the Amalekites (xxv. 17–19), who had long since disappeared, would be as utterly out of date as a law in New Jersey at the present time offering a bounty for killing wolves and bears, or a royal proclamation in Great Britain ordering the expulsion of the Danes? A law contemplating foreign conquests (xx. 10–15) would have been absurd when the urgent question was whether Judah could maintain its own existence against the encroachments of Babylon and Egypt. A law discriminating against Ammon and Moab (xxiii. 3, 4), in favor of Edom (vers. 7, 8), had its warrant in the Mosaic period, but not in the time of the later kings. Jeremiah discriminates precisely the other way, promising a future restoration to Moab (xlviii. 47) and

Ammon (xlix. 6), which he denies to Edom (xlix. 17, 18), who is also to Joel (iii. 19), Obadiah, and Isaiah (lxiii. 1–6), the representative foe of the people of God. . . . The allusions to Egypt imply familiarity with and recent residence in that land. . . . And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, which, while it contemplates the possible selection of a king in the future (Deut. xvii. 14 ff.), nowhere implies an actual regal government, but vests the supreme central authority in a judge and the priesthood (xvii. 8–12; xix. 17); which lays special stress on the requirements that the king must be a native and not a foreigner (xvii. 15), when the undisputed line of succession had for ages been fixed in the family of David, and that he must not 'cause the people to return to Egypt' (ver. 16), as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Num. xiv. 4), but which no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan?"[1]

These are weighty arguments — how weighty we may see by examining one of the allusions in detail. Take such a verse as Deut. xi. 10: "For the land, whither thou goest in to possess it, is not as the land of Egypt, from whence ye came out, where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs." What possible meaning or appropriateness could such a verse have for the contemporaries of King Josiah? Such little touches are all the more convincing for their purely incidental and undesigned character. That is not the language of a forger living centuries after the conquest.

THE HISTORICAL SITUATION REQUIRED BY P

If now we turn to the Priestly Code to examine its historical situation, we shall reach precisely the same result. It

[1] Moses and the Prophets, pp. 63–64.

has already been shown that, on the face of it, the Code refers to wilderness conditions; but the critics seek to neutralize that by suggesting that this is an assumed dress. If that were so, then we should find the conditions of the exilic or post-exilic period underlying the laws. What is, in fact, the historical situation postulated?

THE CONCENTRATION OF THE PEOPLE

The Israelites are represented as being so closely concentrated that they will always be able to keep the three pilgrimage festivals. One exception only is contemplated, and that is singularly instructive: "If any man of you or of your generations shall be unclean by reason of a dead body, or be in a journey afar off, yet he shall keep the passover unto the LORD: in the second month on the fourteenth day at even they shall keep it" (Num. ix. 10 f.). That is the one and only passage in which attention is given to the possibility that the Israelite may be unable to present himself at the religious center on one of the three pilgrimage festivals. Now consider what the circumstances of P's age were. The great bulk of the Jewish people were in Babylonia, but there were also numerous colonies in other countries, notably Egypt. A relatively small proportion of the Jews were to be found in Palestine. For by far the greater number, attendance at the Temple on any occasion whatever was entirely out of the question. The suggestion that this law belongs to that age is therefore grotesque. But let nobody conclude hastily that this is a remark applicable merely to this passage — which the critics with unconscious humor assign to a *late stratum of* P! Except in this one instance, *the entire priestly code from first to last assumes that the whole people are always quartered within easy reach of the religious center.* Let him who can, fit this into the circumstances of the Exile!

THE LAW OF SLAUGHTER FOR FOOD

A singularly amusing illustration of the evidence as to the historical setting is afforded by the laws of Lev. xvii., assigned not to P, but to H, an earlier code of uncertain date.

"At the beginning of this chapter stands a law providing that every Israelite shall bring any ox or lamb or goat he may desire to kill to the door of the tent of meeting. As to the early history of this law, the critical allegiance is divided between competing improbabilities. I shall therefore only deal with the crowning impossibility, which commands unanimous assent. At some time unknown, some person unknown, by editing old material or inventing new — it matters not which — published, under the guise of a camp law, a regulation which was intended to induce every Israelite to bring any animal that was to be killed to Jerusalem. The documentary theory *compels* the critics to assume that this legislation was to be acted on in Canaan, for nobody would believe that camp laws were forged centuries after the period in the desert had passed into history. But this assumption means that every Israelite, no matter where he lived, from Beersheba to Dan, from the sea to the desert, was to go off to Jerusalem whenever he wanted a chop or steak for his dinner, taking with him the live animal from which it was to be obtained!" [1]

It must be remembered that while this argument applies primarily to H, it can be used with equal force against the P theory. The priestly writer who never hesitated about altering or excising any portion of H apparently thought this law so admirably suited to the conditions of the post-exilic age that he joyfully incorporated it in his own epoch-making work. Fancy having to go from Babylonia or Egypt to Jeru-

[1] Studies in Biblical Law, p. 41.

salem in order to get an animal slaughtered to provide food for dinner!

OTHER HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

It has been shown that the duties of the Levites in P are such as would be impossible in any age other than the Mosaic, seeing that nobody could expect a temple to be taken down, carried about, and set up at sundry times: we have also seen that P, if construed in the fashion of the critics, visits with death the performance of functions assigned to them in the second temple. We must add that the Ark had ceased to exist, so that the arrangements for its construction and transport are a little belated. But it is not only in these points, important as they are, that P betrays its true historical setting. Read the account of the war with the Midianites (Num. xxxi.) and the elaborate provisions as to the booty. Can any reasonable being suppose that such commands could have had any meaning at all in the days of the Exile or of Ezra and Nehemiah? When and where were the Jews to win victories and acquire booty? And how about the unions with Midianitish virgins authorized by verse 18? Was there any danger of the post-exilic age which appeared more menacing to the religious leaders or called forth more energetic opposition from them than these foreign unions? Or, again, pass to the last chapter of Numbers and consider the historical setting. What is the complaint urged by the deputation that waits upon Moses? It is this. If heiresses "be married to any of the sons of the tribes of the children of Israel, then shall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of our fathers, and shall be added to the inheritance of the tribe whereunto they shall belong." What a pressing grievance for a legislator to consider and redress

when tribes and tribal lots had long since ceased to exist for ever!

THE HIERARCHICAL ORGANIZATION

It is no better if we turn to the hierarchical organization proposed. Urim and Thummim were not used after the Exile. In lieu of the simple conditions — a small number of full priests and a body of Levites — we find a developed hierarchy, priests, Levites, singers, porters, Nethinim, sons of Solomon's servants. The code that *ex hypothesi* was forged to deal with this state of affairs has no acquaintance with them. The musical services of the Temple are as much beyond its line of vision as the worship of the Synagogue. Even such an organization as that betrayed by the reference in 1 Sam. ii. 36 to the appointment by the high-priest to positions carrying pecuniary emoluments is far beyond the primitive simplicity of P. And if we turn to the individual sacrifices it contemplates, we find only fresh evidence of early conditions. If a man bring a burnt-offering, he is to kill and flay it himself! There are similar rules in the case of other sacrifices. Now test this by reference to such sacrifices as those of Solomon (1 Kings viii. 63). Is it conceivable that, as luxury and refinement increased and as the number of victims offered were multiplied, the well-to-do classes would themselves kill and flay the animals? Can we believe that they would have either the inclination to act thus or the power of killing a large number of victims single-handed in any reasonable space of time? The more this is pondered the easier it is to see how it came about that heathens performed services of this kind in the temple of Solomon, and the more intelligible do the changes of Ezekiel and the representations of the Chronicler become. In truth here, as elsewhere, P shows us the conditions of the earliest age: and subsequent

changes were due to the impossibility of applying such regulations without modification to the circumstances of more advanced periods.

EZRA AND THE LAW

One other piece of historical evidence must be mentioned before we pass to the next division of the conservative case. If this law was really forged about the time of Ezra, how came it that the latter so fundamentally mistook its object? The statements of P constantly show that its provisions were meant only to reach the people through the teaching of the priests (Lev. x. 11, etc.; cp. Deut. xxiv. 8; xxxiii. 10, etc.). How then are we to explain Ezra's conduct in reading the whole law to the people?

THE LEGAL EVIDENCE OF MOSAIC DATE

If there is evidence of date in the historical setting of the laws, there is also plenty in the more technical branches of the subject. The following excerpt from an article in the *Churchman* for May, 1906, explains and illustrates this feature:

"Some years ago I had occasion to read Sir Henry Maine's books on early law as a continuous whole. In doing so I was repeatedly struck by the general similarity of the ancient ideas he was expounding to those embodied in portions of the Mosaic legislation. The laws of a nation in a given age necessarily reflect its habits of thought and civilization with considerable accuracy; and as the perusal of chapter after chapter that dealt with the legal ideas and institutions of the ancient Romans, Indians, Celts, and Britons roused recollections of the Pentateuch, the idea presented itself that here at last was an independent test by which the authenticity of the Mosaic legislation might be tried. I turned eagerly to the

Bible and found that my experiences were swiftly realized. Of the archaic complexion of the jural laws there could be no possible doubt. At that time I had only the vaguest notions of what the modern critical views really were; but I knew enough to realize that, if the laws were in fact ancient, there must be some fatal error in any theory that made them a comparatively recent literary forgery. Perhaps the best way of making this clear to general readers is to take a very simple instance. In any society where land is the subject of individual ownership, certain questions must necessarily arise at a very early period of its history. A farmer dies. What is to happen to his farm? There must be some rule which determines who is to inherit it. In other words, there must be a law of intestate succession. Now, it happens that this is one of the topics with which the Pentateuch deals. A certain Zelophehad had died in the wilderness, leaving no male issue. His daughters raised a claim to the share of land which would have been allotted to their father had he lived. It was decided that their contention ought to be upheld (Num. xxvii. 1 ff.), and the rules that were to govern the succession to a land-owner, who died leaving no male issue, were laid down in general terms. We need go no further into the question for our immediate purpose. Anybody who thinks for a few minutes will be able to recall abundant instances of persons who within his own experience have died without leaving sons; and it is obvious that no large community in which land was the subject of individual ownership could exist for a year without the question being raised and settled. When, therefore, we find in the Pentateuch certain rules purporting to have been laid down in the days of Moses which deal with this question, we are bound to concede that only three classes of hypotheses can by any chance be tenable.

The first of these would admit that we have here genuine, very ancient rules in their original language. In the abstract this does not necessarily imply the historical character of Moses or of the setting in which we at present find them; but, as we shall see later, it undoubtedly involves this in fact. Secondly, it might theoretically be said that these rules are in substance very ancient, but have been put into a modern dress by a later substitution of newer expressions for others which had become archaisms. But, this, again, breaks down. The higher critics do not venture to suggest that there is any philological evidence which could possibly warrant such an assumption; and in view of the known conservatism of lawyers all the world over, such a theory would be extremely improbable. A third possibility can, however, be conceived. A nation may change its law of succession, and if there were any facts to warrant this theory, it might perhaps be suggested that at some date such a change was effected. But, in fact, there is no ground for any such suggestion. That land was the subject of individual ownership is abundantly clear from scattered references in the historical and prophetical books; nor is it less clear that there was a law of succession and of redemption, which was either identical with, or similar to, that which we find in the Pentateuch. If we turn from such considerations to larger aspects of the subject, the case becomes overwhelming. A revolution in the law of succession is not effected by a few strokes of a forger's pen without leaving any mark in history. If the rules laid down in the case of Zelophehad's daughters were not the law of the Israelites in the period from the conquest to the exile, it is clear that they must have had some other law. What was this? How was it altered? Was it, too, attributed to God? If so, how came it to be set aside so lightly, and who ventured

to forge new laws when there were rules already in operation which had Divine sanction? How came anybody to believe that God had confided these rules to Moses, and that for centuries other rules had been universally observed, while the Divine institution had remained wholly unknown? And what about the expectant heirs who would have inherited, had the law remained unaltered, but were dispossessed by the newly-discovered forgery? Did *they* believe in the Divine origin of these rules? And what conceivable motive could the forgers have had? It would be as easy as it is unnecessary to multiply such questions. The critics have no answer to them. Any unprejudiced reader will see that the theory of the late origin of such rules is untenable. He will understand, too, why it is that a lawyer reading the higher critics should feel an eager desire to get them into a witness-box and cross-examine them."

THE LAW OF THEFT

"I have taken the law of intestate succession as a very simple example of the kind of evidence that comparative and historical jurisprudence can supply; but it must of course be clearly understood that this is merely a single example. The jural laws abound in evidences of date. Take, for instance, the rule by which the thief who stole a sheep had to pay four sheep if he was caught in the act. Everybody knows Nathan's parable; but not everybody realizes that David's answer "he shall restore the lamb *fourfold*" (2 Sam. xii. 6), is good evidence of the existence in the early days of the monarchy of some rule which gave fourfold compensation in certain cases of theft. Still less do most readers of the Bible understand the reason for the rule, or dream that it points clearly to a certain state of civilization, and that a very early state. Yet there are parallels in many countries, the most

noteworthy being provided by Roman law, according to which at one period the *fur manifestus,* or thief caught in the act, had to pay a fourfold penalty; while the *fur nec manifestus,* or thief who was not caught in the act, only made double restitution. Now, the reason and meaning of such rules are well ascertained. They point to a state of society in which law and the power of the courts are still weak and the desire for vengeance is strong. It is to prevent the injured party from revenging himself, to avoid the possibility of a blood feud, to save the society the loss of one or more fighting men, that the bribe of a fourfold restitution is held out. There is clearly no *moral* distinction between a thief who is caught in the act and one who is not. The guilt is the same in both cases; but the hot and sudden anger, the danger of bloodshed are not. And so the ancient law-giver, who is compelled to take into consideration the circumstances and feelings of the society with which he has to deal, adjusts his rules accordingly. Indeed, it is only by comparison that we can discover in what respects the laws of Moses are unique, and the lack of knowledge which would enable them to make such comparisons has led some recent writers into astonishing theories." [1]

OTHER LEGAL EVIDENCE

Other similar evidences must be treated more shortly. The following is extracted from the writer's article on "Law in the Old Testament" in "Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary": "The laws clearly prove that the intellectual condition of the tribes was very primitive. Such elementary distinctions as those between murder and manslaughter, or compulsion and intentional wrong-doing are only expressed in the most cumbrous and elementary way. Num. xv. 22–31,

[1] The Churchman, May, 1906, pp. 286–290.

with its inadequate distinction between unwitting and high-handed sins, tells the same tale. Again, the whole of the 'physiological psychology' that finds expression in regulations about clean and unclean, etc., testifies most clearly to the low level of reflection attained by the people. The scanty use of writing for legal purposes is also significant." It may be added that the laws of oaths and strangers and many other individual laws corroborate this view. So again do the social and economic conditions portrayed by the legislation. But for these and other similar topics the reader must consult "Studies in Biblical Law" and the legal articles in "Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary."

THE EVIDENCE OF THE NARRATIVE

The narrative also contains much that indicates date. For one thing it, like the legislation, attests the prevalence of very primitive conceptions and conditions. As examples, we may take the revelation of the Name of God, with its background in early ideas and the rudimentary arrangements for the administration of justice. But here we also meet with signs of contemporary knowledge that are not without their weight. For example, Mr. McNeile, in his edition of Exodus, writes on vii. 19: "Earthenware vessels are not mentioned; and several writers note that it is only in earthenware that the discolored Nile waters can be made and kept clean. But it is improbable that this intentional accuracy is to be ascribed to P." The value of this testimony is enhanced by the bias it reveals. Accuracy of this kind would be most improbable in such a writer as the P of the critical case: on the other hand it could not be absent from the work of a contemporary. Here again are a couple of instances in JE taken from the standard English higher critical commentary on Numbers.

"It will thus be seen that we have here a very vivid and

true picture of Egyptian life; and, in particular, of the life of the lower orders." [1] "The description is drawn from life, corresponding accurately to modern observations in its various details — the great multitude of the birds, their use of wind in their migration, the lowness of their flight, the ease with which when weary they are netted." [2]

Such traits cannot be without their weight for any estimate of authorship and date.

The External Evidence of Date

Putting aside for the moment the testimony of tradition, including the Bible itself, we may first ask, What allusions have we to the existence of the Mosaic legislation? Now here some care is necessary. Very many passages are discounted by the critical theory by means of two positions. First, the critics can always say, "Yes, this is an allusion to such and such an event, or such and such a custom; but you cannot prove that the author had before him the exact narrative or the exact law that we have in the present Pentateuch." That is of course quite true. A reference to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah only implies that the writer was acquainted with the story from some source; it does not tell us what the source of his knowledge was. Similarly with laws. We may produce instances of laws being in operation, and the critics reply, "Yes, that is true: but then our documents incorporate many older rules." In particular they are fond of saying that P embodies older temple praxis. It is difficult not to feel that this artificial way of regarding later references will disappear when once the facts respecting the main branches of the higher critical case sink in. It appears to be mainly due to the prevalence of Wellhausen's theories

[1] Gray, Numbers, p. 104 (on Num. xi. 5).

[2] Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 117 (of the quails in Num. xi. 31–33).

respecting "sanctuaries" and Levites, and with the spread of sounder reasoning it will probably vanish. But for the present we must reckon with it.

The second position is the division of the Pentateuch and the assigning of different dates to different portions. For example, there are references to Deuteronomy in the book of Kings, but then the author of that book admittedly lived after the reign of Josiah: hence these references do not damage the hypothesis, since they prove acquaintance with Deuteronomy but not with Leviticus. For these reasons it is useless to quote many of the obvious references to the Pentateuch. There remain a number of passages which even these hypotheses cannot invalidate.

EZEKIEL AND P

It is freely said that Ezekiel may have known H, but was unacquainted with P. Now there is an important passage in which the prophet comes as near to a direct statement that he knew P as it was possible for any author to come who lived before the critical theory had been invented. In xxii. 26 we read: "Her priests have done violence to my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have put no difference between the holy and the common, neither have they caused men to discern between the unclean and the clean," etc. I turn to P and I read, "And ye shall put difference between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean; and ye shall teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the LORD hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses" (Lev. x. 10 f.; cf. the following chapters). What can Ezekiel possibly have meant, save that there was to his knowledge a law in existence which dealt with the topics of P, and used the language of P, and like P was to be taught to the people by the priests? Other phrases might refer to

H: but here we have the clearest possible indication of the existence of P. If words have any meaning at all, Ezekiel knew of a law of unquestionable authority which had been violated by the priests.

LAW AND TEACHING

At this point it is necessary once more to emphasize a fact that is usually overlooked. The uniform representation of the Pentateuch is that a large body of law was not intended to reach the people directly, but only through the teaching of the priests. That appears clearly enough in the passage just quoted from Leviticus and in other passages of that book and of Deuteronomy. As a necessary consequence the allusions to P that we may expect before the Exile can only be allusions to a law that is to reach the people through the priests. That teaching was a priestly function appears repeatedly in the allusions of the prophets and is freely conceded by the critics. The question, therefore, narrows itself down to this: Was that teaching the result or the precursor of the written law? Hosea writes: "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children" (iv. 6). This certainly proves the existence of a law which was not being properly taught by the priests. It is said with some reason that the contents of this law seem to have been of a moral nature. So are many of the contents of Leviticus — especially those assigned to H. But the same prophet carries us a good deal further.

HOSEA'S TESTIMONY

"Because Ephraim hath multiplied altars to sin, altars have been unto him to sin. Though I write for him my law

in ten thousand precepts, they are counted as a strange thing. As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it; but the LORD accepteth them not" (viii. 11–13), and here the context points to ritual. It cannot be doubted that this passage means that to the knowledge of the prophet there was a written law of great volume. Its observance would have prevented Ephraim from multiplying altars to sin; the altar it sanctioned would not have been unto him to sin, i.e. it would have acted as a center of righteousness if the law had been properly observed. The covenant and the law of the first verse of the chapter might of course refer to Ex. xix.–xxiv., but this cannot be said of the ten thousand written precepts which must refer to a written law of great bulk. There are other allusions (e.g. Amos ii. 4), but these are more capable of being evaded by the critical hypotheses.

EVIDENCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF INSTITUTIONS

Similarly there are many passages in the prophets and historical books that testify to the existence of Pentateuchal laws and institutions; but, as already explained, it is sought to neutralize this testimony by suggesting that the rules existed and were acted on before they were written down. For example, Amos says: "But ye gave the Nazirites wine to drink" (ii. 12). The law on the subject occurs only in P, but it would be said that here the late author had taken up the earlier rule. Hence such passages do not persuade the Wellhausen critics of their error. But fortunately there are in P certain institutions of which the critics definitely assert that they are late. Accordingly references that prove the earlier existence of such institutions have a very different probative value. Thus it is alleged that before the Exile there was but one national burnt-offering and one national

meal-offering each day; whereas, Num. xxviii. demands two. Now in 1 Kings xviii. 29, 36, we find references to the offering of the evening meal-offering, but 2 Kings iii. 20 speaks of "the time of offering the meal-offering" in connection with the morning. Therefore these two meal-offerings were actually in existence centuries before the date assigned to P — who, on the critical theory, first introduced them. So 2 Kings xvi. 15 speaks of "the morning burnt-offering, and the evening meal-offering . . . . with the burnt-offering of all the people of the land and their meal-offering." This again gives us the *two* burnt-offerings, though, on the hypothesis, they were unknown to preëxilic custom. Similarly in other cases: Jer. xxxii. shows us the land laws in actual operation: Ezekiel is familiar with the jubilee laws — though, on the critical hypothesis, these did not yet exist. Jeroboam was acquainted with P's date for Tabernacles, though the critics allege that the date was first fixed in the Exile. On these and similar points reference may be made to the writer's "Studies in Biblical Law" and "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," and also to the legal articles in "Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary."

XI

THE EVIDENCE OF PRE-MOSAIC DATE

THERE are many signs that the book of Genesis contains materials that are in many cases older than the time of Moses — in some instances than the time of Abraham. A good deal of attention is given by the critics to details which, as they allege, prove that some of the stories of Genesis originated in Canaan. It is claimed that the minute accuracy of the geography testifies to their origin, and also such expressions as "seaward" for "westward." Then it is argued that if the stories really come from Canaan they cannot be Mosaic. They must date from after the conquest. But the fact is that if the patriarchs did really live in Canaan, as the narrative states, any *genuine* traditions of their lives would necessarily display these characteristics unless they had been rewritten before being incorporated in the Pentateuch.

THE EVIDENCE OF GENESIS X. 19

The question therefore arises, whether it is possible to point to any evidence that indisputably refers to a pre-Mosaic period and cannot have been composed in post-Mosaic times. The answer is in the affirmative.

"In Gen. x. 19 we read, '*As thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboïim.*" The places named were destroyed in Abraham's lifetime. It follows that this passage must have been originally composed before the catastrophe narrated in Gen. xix. Mr. Carpenter attributes it, however, to a late stratum of 'J,' making it subsequent to xiii. 10, which was obviously composed *after* the destruction

of Sodom. Dr. Driver assigns the passage to 'J,' and writes:

"'Nor does the language of "J" and "E" bring us to any more definite conclusion. Both belong to the golden period of Hebrew literature. They resemble the best parts of Judges and Samuel (much of which cannot be greatly later than David's own time); but whether they are actually earlier or later than these, the language and style do not enable us to say. . . . All things considered, both "J" and "E" may be assigned with the greatest probability to the early centuries of the monarchy.' (Literature of the Old Testament (sixth edition), pp. 124–125.)

"In other words, Dr. Driver would on "literary" grounds be prepared to accept a date 1,000 years after the age of Abraham as the time of composition of this passage. What precisely is the value of a method which does not permit its ablest and most cautious exponent to arrive at results that are correct to within 1,000 years?"[1]

THE LEGAL EVIDENCE

Similarly with the legal evidence, which, in the case of the book of Genesis, is very interesting and convincing.

"By an application of the comparative method it is possible to show the minute accuracy of many of the narratives in Genesis. Evidence comes unexpectedly from the ends of the earth to corroborate out-of-the-way details of the history. Take, for instance, the story of Jacob's service for Rachel. This form of marriage — called by the Germans *Dienstehe,* service-marriage — is said by Post to be universal. The service is a regular substitute for the bride-price (Hebrew *Mohar*) when the suitor is too poor to find the price in any other way. Sometimes the bridegroom becomes the slave of the bride's family for good. Among other communities the

[1] **The Churchman, February, 1908, p. 95.**

service only endures for a term of years. Instances are quoted ranging from six months to seven years. And so, in the light of the comparative evidence, it becomes clear that Jacob, Laban, Leah, and Rachel were individuals, not tribes. What sense could the story of the service bear if we were dealing with tribes? The evidence is, of course, cumulative. It is not one touch that is corroborated, but many." [1]

"But, then, may it not be argued that the legal conditions were common to the post-Mosaic period and the patriarchal age? Can it not be said that in legal matters the narratives are more or less coloured by the ideas of later ages? The answer — which is important — is in the negative. There are, of course, no sufficient materials for writing a history of Hebrew law in Biblical times, but, so far as it goes, the evidence of the Book of Genesis will not fit in with the critical theories. Perhaps the most interesting case is the conveyance of the field of Machpelah to Abraham, a passage attributed by the critics to the supposititious exilic or post-exilic 'P.' Like every other legal transaction in the Book of Genesis, and unlike every Babylonian legal tablet, it is conspicuous for the absence of writing. When it is contrasted with the very modern form of conveyance with which we meet in Jer. xxxii., it at once becomes evident that it represents a much more primitive stage of legal development. The instance is peculiarly important, because we are asked to believe that 'P' (who is supposed to have been very much under Babylonian influence) forged or inserted the narrative of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah for the purpose of giving validity to the claim of the Israelites to the land of Canaan. Now, had that been so, it is evident that a writer who, according to the critics, is distinguished by a peculiarly lawyer-like style, would

[1] **The Churchman, January, 1908, p. 17.**

never have failed to mention every particular that was material to the complete validity of the transaction according to the ideas of his own age. Nor can it be said that he would have been deterred by any scantiness of information or any scruples as to the truth, for *ex hypothesi* he was an admitted master of fiction, wholly devoid of anything that we should regard as historical conscience."

THE LAW OF HOMICIDE

"The law of homicide also presents us with some interesting testimony. The story of Cain the outlaw, subject to death at the hands of any man who met him, reveals a legal institution well known to students of early law. But here it is important to notice that it brings us face to face with an earlier state of law than that postulated by the Mosaic legislation. The blood feud is not yet recognised. It is not yet the duty of the avenger of the blood alone to exact retribution for the crime. The murderer is expelled from the religious and social community, and left as an outcast from the peace and protection of the tribe, to encounter single-handed any stranger or enemy — the terms are synonymous in early times — he may meet. Nor is the position much better for the higher critics if we turn to 'P': 'Whoso sheddeth the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed.' That is not the law of 'JE' or 'D' or 'P' with the place appointed for refuge in certain cases of homicide. The distinction between murder and other classes of homicide has not yet been drawn. Here again, there are universal parallels to the course of legal history as depicted in the Bible. The distinction is elsewhere later than the treatment of all cases of homicide as being on the same footing."

THE FATHER'S POWER

"Another matter that has probably never been considered by any higher critic is the history of the *patria potestas* — the legal power of a father over his children. As at Rome, so among the ancient Hebrews, the *jus vitae necisque* (the power of life and death) was at first quite unlimited. We have several instances of this, the most striking being Judah's conduct to his daughter-in-law (xxxviii. 24), who had passed into his *potestas* by her marriage, and Reuben's treatment of his children (xlii. 37). It is to be noted that in neither case is there any suggestion of a trial. The *paterfamilias* acts with plenary authority. But in both Rome and ancient Israel this power underwent curtailment. It is true that the power to sell or pledge children endured to the end of Old Testament times (Neh. v. 5), and probably the paternal power was in many ways extremely extensive till a very late period, but the family jurisdiction in cases of wrong-doing had been greatly curtailed before the days of Moses. I am not thinking merely of the provisions of Deut. xxi. 18–21. If they were all we had, the critics might reasonably suggest that the relative dates of 'D' and 'JE' would account for the alteration. But it is clear that in Ex. xxi 15, 17, offences against parents are no longer regarded as matters for the domestic tribunal, but are included within the competence of the ordinary courts of elders. Times have changed since the days of Judah and Tamar." [1]

THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

It is in the light of these facts that we turn to glance at the archæological evidence. In one way or another a good deal of corroboration of the biblical narrative has been obtained,

[1] The Churchman, January, 1908, pp. 19–21.

but it is sought to neutralize this by hypotheses of later borrowings. If, for example, some detail of P is corroborated by some Assyriological tablet, the critics forthwith strive to account for it by conjuring up a picture of a later priestly writer sitting in a Babylonian library in the exilic or post-exilic period and endeavoring to mould the information derived from his researches into a monotheistic Hebrew narrative. If J shows affinities to old deluge stories, we are reminded that Palestine was saturated with foreign culture at many periods, so that the legends may have been current in the country long before J wrote. If, again, the story of Joseph proves to be minutely true to old Egyptian customs, we are asked to think of Messrs. J and E visiting Egypt or else cramming up Egyptian data from local sources of information in order to impart the appropriate coloring to their romances.

IMPOSSIBILITY OF THE CRITICAL EXPLANATIONS

It is true that nothing could be less artificial and studied than the stories of Genesis, but considerations of that kind are entirely foreign to the mental outlook of the critics. But the whole body of this evidence takes on a different complexion in the light of the facts that we have considered. If Gen. x. 19 can have been composed only in or before the age of Abraham, archæological confirmations of other portions of that chapter are not to be dismissed as purely fortuitous or as the result of the hypothetical P's imaginary Babylonian researches. If the Noachian law of homicide is proved by comparative jurisprudence to be indubitably earlier than the law of Numbers — itself exceptionally archaic — it cannot be supposed that the narrative in which it stands (the sequel of the flood story in P) is an exilic borrowing from a people who

had a different law of homicide. Given a law that is not Babylonian and is more primitive than that of JE or P or D, but one conclusion is possible. No priestly forger could have composed a narrative that would be corroborated by researches conducted some twenty-four centuries later into the customs and institutions of primitive societies all over the world. Therefore when we find archæological support of the incidents of Genesis we may safely conclude that the coincidences are not due to the causes suggested by the critics, but to the genuine antiquity of the tradition. Were they not, anachronisms would inevitably have crept in.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL CONFIRMATION

In point of fact the accuracy of the delineation of old Egyptian life incidentally given by Genesis has been demonstrated by the growth of knowledge, and nothing is now heard of the once familiar argument that the local coloring is entirely false to the facts of old Egyptian life. Again, a historical background has been provided for Gen. xiv., and Babylonian traditions of a deluge bearing some resemblance to the biblical story have been recovered. On the other hand, the amount of corroboration that is given by Assyriology is often greatly exaggerated. The creation accounts produced are extraordinarily unlike the narrative of Genesis, and even the alleged connection between the biblical and the Babylonian stories of the deluge cannot be said to have been demonstrated. Yet it is intrinsically probable that if the flood was a historical event, accounts of it would have been preserved in Babylonia, and in view of Abraham's migration, the biblical narrative should bear a strong likeness to them. That and the hope of upsetting the documentary theory are probably responsible for the readiness of some writers to exaggerate

every feature of resemblance. But whether or not the actual narratives display close philological likeness, the historical fact is undoubtedly corroborated by the existence of such legends in Babylonia, while scientific support has been provided by Professor G. Frederick Wright in his very valuable "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History."

XII

THE TESTIMONY OF TRADITION

The unanimous testimony of Jewish, Samaritan, and Christian tradition assigns to Moses the authorship of the Pentateuch. This tradition is embodied in numerous passages of the Old Testament itself. It is found from the book of Joshua onwards. It was strong enough to induce the Samaritans — who were bitter enemies of the Jews — to adopt this work as their Law, although they did not accept any of the other canonical books of the Jews. How unlikely that they would have acted thus if they had not had the strongest reasons for believing in its genuineness! The exilic or post-exilic origin of P need not be further considered at this point, for it is difficult to suppose that any man who is capable of weighing evidence could believe in this theory after carefully considering what has been said above; but would the Samaritans have accepted the Pentateuch at all if they had not believed in its authenticity? But the evidence is not confined to the Samaritans and the later Canonical books supported by Jewish and Christian tradition. There are plain statements in the Pentateuch itself ascribing to Moses the writing of at any rate certain portions, and *those portions belong to all the three main supposititious sources JE, D, and P.* Further, every law

in the Pentateuch is distinctly ascribed to the Mosaic Age — in almost all cases to Moses himself. A theory of the purely oral transmission of these laws cannot be held to possess the slightest probability when considered in the light of the considerations which arise from the bulk and nature of the legislation, the archæological testimony to the familiarity of writing in the Mosaic Age, and the clear statements of the Pentateuch that Moses did in fact write. And so there only remains one possibility — to accept the statements of the narrative itself and admit that these laws were in fact written down, and that by the person to whom their writing is ascribed. No other hypothesis can be said to be at all tenable.

XIII

CONSTRUCTIVE CONCLUSIONS

In seeking to sum up roughly the main results of the critical controversy, we are at once attracted by the fact that the record will not be one of losses only. On the contrary, a book that emerges triumphantly from such an ordeal as that to which the Pentateuch has been subjected, does not return with diminished authority. Nor again is the ultimate issue likely to be without a special value of its own. It may justly be claimed that in many matters our knowledge and understanding of the work of the great lawgiver have been very materially increased. The following appear to be some of the main products of the discussion.

Traditional accretions to the work of Moses are removed in more than one way. The most important of those accretions is the view taken of the meaning of the legislation and the consequent interpretation of the later history of Israel. A better construction of the laws, and an increased comprehension of their meaning and object are no insignificant gain. And here may be explained the reason for omitting from the present volume any discussion of the perplexities of order in the legal sections and the frequent repetitions. The writer has often dealt with these topics, but he feels that owing to their technical nature they would be out of place in a publication like the present, while the amount of detail involved for any adequate handling of the subject would make inordinate demands on the available space. Yet he would venture to quote the following passage from the *Princeton Theolog-*

ical Review for April, 1907, as showing the possibility of taking up an attitude that is fundamentally different from that of the critics, and suggesting very divergent solutions of the difficulties:

THE PENTATEUCH A PIECE OF STATESMANSHIP

"In the view of the whole critical school the Pentateuch is at best an ordinary book, at worst a field for practising their quaint arithmetical exercises. In my view it is not primarily a piece of literature at all; it is a piece of statesmanship and must be judged as such. While, therefore, I recognise that it is impossible for anybody now to dive into the mind of Moses so far as to be able to assign precise reasons for the position of each individual command in the whole complex body of legislation, I believe that attention to the considerations that must have been present to the law-giver's mind, aided by a careful study of many points that have hitherto escaped notice, will enable us not merely to answer Dr. Driver's arguments, but also to throw new light on problems that have hitherto remained unsolved."[1]

THE ORDER OF THE LAWS

Those who may desire to see how this view can be worked out are referred to the article from which this extract is taken, and to the other publications that have been mentioned in the course of the discussion. This much, however, I wish to make clear at once. The recognition of the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuchal legislation does not mean the shirking of questions relating to the order or the recurrence of laws: on the contrary, it involves the answering of such questions by means of the resources of textual criticism, and the various branches of jurisprudence. One single example may perhaps be given. A peasant who experiences bad sea-

[1] Princeton Theological Review, April, 1907, pp. 190 f.

sons inevitably feels the want of money. Usually he has to borrow. But money is frequently not to be had, save for interest and on security. In ancient societies such security could be given not merely on his land but on his person. Hence there is a natural association of ideas between laws regulating loans and interest, land laws, and laws relating to loss of freedom through insolvency. That association of ideas was inevitably represented when the problem was treated in antiquity, whether on its legal or historical side. Historically we may see the various factors at work in the account of Joseph and the Egyptians at the time of the famine: we also meet with the same association in ancient legislations. Leviticus xxv. presents us with an instance of this, and if we look at that chapter in the Oxford Hexateuch we shall see that the critics have been totally unable to make head or tail of the grouping of subjects. Yet once the background is restored everything becomes obvious. That is one instance, and a simple one, of the way in which the investigations that the critical assault has necessitated tend to throw light on the work of the lawgiver by leading to a restoration of the historical circumstances, a more scientific apprehension of the meaning of his words, and consequently a clearer insight into his work and achievements.

OTHER RESULTS

Similarly with the history. Here perhaps the most striking illustration is that which has already been cited — the rehabilitation of Ezekiel.

Again, as already explained, the textual researches which have been stimulated by the higher critical theories must end by giving us clear pictures of many transactions that had been enveloped in obscurity. The higher critics have not succeeded

in doing what they thought they had, but they have been successful in their attack on a few glosses (such as Deut. x. 6 f.) and a few corrupt words, and also on the *order* of the present text.

Once more, the discussion has revealed the fact that in the book of Genesis Moses undoubtedly incorporated preëxilic sources, whether oral or written, in some cases without modifying their phraseology.

These are the main scholarly gains from the discussion provoked by the higher critics — a better comprehension of laws and history, a better text, the recognition that the Pentateuch incorporates post-Mosaic notes, and that Genesis contains many pre-Mosaic elements. As to the fantastic documentary and evolutionary hypotheses, they are doomed, however numerous the professional reputations and publishing enterprises that depend upon them.

For those who live in our age the Pentateuch does not hold the position which it once held and will hold again. We are not allowed simply to believe without question. The truth we desire is not ours for the asking: we are called upon to fight for and win it — often under circumstances that tend to profound discouragement. Yet this state of affairs brings its own blessings in its train. The truth for which one has fought and won is not likely to be less dear or less strongly held than that which was gained without difficulty or sacrifice.

INDEX I

GENESIS

i. 1–ii. 3 13 f., 87
i. 1 13 f., 87
ii. 4 13 f., 30, 87
ii. 5 30
ii. 7 30
ii. 8 30
iii. 1 27,36
iii. 3 27
iii. 5 27
iv. 1 26, 30
iv. 25 27
iv. 25 f. 88
iv. 26 12, 26, 30
v. 28 88 f.
v. 29 28
vii. 9 27
ix. 27 27
x. 114
x. 1 105
x. 19 134, 139
x. 20 105
x. 22 105
x. 23 105
xii. 8 62
xii. 9 105
xii. 10–xiii. 1 105
xiii. 1 105
xiii. 3 105
xiii. 4 105
xiii. 5 105
xiii. 6 105
xiii. 10 134
xiii. 18 62
xiv. 139
xiv. 14 79
xiv. 21 79
xv. 1 26
xv. 2 12, 26
xv. 3 f. 98
xv. 17 f. 98
xvi. 1 27
xvi. 2 27
xvi. 7 ff. 98
xvi. 11 29, 32, 33
xvii. 1 26
xvii. 12 79
xviii. 7 62
xix. 98
xix. 29 27, 30
xx. 34
xx. 4 30, 34
xx. 14 35, 79, 84
xx. 17 27, 34, 84
xx. 18 27
xxi. 1 26, 42
xxi. 2 30
xxi. 6 30
xxii. 108
xxii. 2 108
xxii. 11 21, 26
xxii. 14–18 27
xxii. 14 19, 108
xxii. 15 ff. 98
xxiv. 101
xxiv. 10 101
xxvi. 24 27, 98
xxvii. 7 26
xxvii. 9–14 62
xxviii. 98
xxviii. 21 27
xxix.–xxxiii. 114
xxix.–xxxiii. 20–23 44
xxix. 24 114
xxix. 27 42, 45
xxix. 28 42, 45, 114
xxix. 29 114
xxix. 30 42
xxix. 31 45
xxix. 35 44
xxx. 9 45
xxx. 14–16 45
xxx. 21 115
xxx. 22 115
xxx. 24–26 44
xxxi. 1, 2, 3, 5 28 f.
xxxi. 18 115
xxxi. 20 101
xxxi. 21–23 100
xxxi. 24 101
xxxi. 41 42, 45
xxxi. 42 97
xxxi. 51–54 101
xxxi. 54 62
xxxii. 29 (28) 27
xxxii. 30, 31 28

xxxiii. 5, 10, 11 27
xxxiii. 18 115
xxxiii. 20 62
xxxiv. 29 79
xxxvii. 2 43
xxxvii. 25 8
xxxvii. 28, 36 8, 47
xxxviii. 43
xxxviii. 1 46
xxxviii. 24 138
xxxix. 1 8
xxxix. 9 27
xxxix. 20–22 9
xxxix. 23 28
xl. 1–7 47
xl. 2–4, 7 9
xli. 46 43
xlii. 37 138
xliii. 16 62
xliii. 18 79
xliii. 23, 29 27
xliv. 79
xliv. 16 27
xlv. 9 27
xlvi. 8, 12, 26, 27 43
xlvii. 19 79
xlviii. 15 27
l. 24 27

Exodus

i. 1 43
i. 5 43
iii. 15 40
iii. 19 84
iv. 14 67, 77
vi. 3 12 f., 31, 35, 37, 38, 39
vii. 19 128
xiii. 21 f. 93
xiii. 22 54
xvi. 99
xvi. 4 99
xvi. 13 11
xvii. 42, 98
xvii. 1–7 11
xvii. 6 95 f.
xvii. 9 53
xviii. 49 f. 54
xviii. 5 ff. 20, 54
xviii. 13–26 103
xix.–xxiv. 132
xix. 22, 24 24
xx. 24–26 61 ff.
xx. 2ff. 10 f., 63
xxi. 4 79
xxi. 15, 17 138
xxii. 1 (xxi. 37) 62
xxiii. 19 66
xxiii. 20 96
xxiv. 14 54
xxv. f. 9, 53
xxvii. 1–8 61, 64
xxxiii. 7–11 9, 10, 53 f.
xxiv. 22 66
xxxiv. 26 66

Leviticus

i. ff. 74
ix. 22 50
x. 10 f. 130
x. 11 123
xiii. f. 76
xiii. 47 ff. 76
xiv. 76
xvii.–xxvi. 15
xvii. 120
xxv. 10 f., 144
xxv. 39 79

Numbers

i. 50–53 73
iii. 1 14
v. 9–10 78
vi. 22–27 50
ix. 10 f. 119
x. 33 92 ff.
x. 35, 36 93 ff.
xi. 12
xi. 4–6 11, 99
xi. 5 129
xi. 31 ff. 11, 129
xii. 10
xiii. 1–3 103
xiv. 4 118
xiv. 45 51
xv. 22–31 127
xvi. 48 f.
xvi. 2 48
xvi. 3, 7, 9, 13 116
xvi. 24 48
xvi.25 48
xvi. 27 48
xvi. 32, 35 48
xviii. 3 74
xx. 98
xx. 1–13 11
xx. 22–29 7
xx. 22 51
xxi. 1–3 50, 52
xxi 3 51
xxi. 4 51
xxii. 22–34 101

xxiii. 7 102 f.
xxvi. 10 49
xxvii. 1 ff. 124
xxvii. 3 49, 54
xxviii. f. 65
xxviii. 133
xxxi. 121
xxxi. 18 121
xxxiii. 7
xxxiiii. 30, 31 7
xxxiii. 38 7, 57

DEUTERONOMY

i. 9–13 103
i. 22 f. 103
i. 37, 38 104
i. 40 50
i. 46 50
ii. 1, 14 50
x. 5 46
x. 6 f. 145
x. 6 7, 46, 56
x. 7 7, 49
x. 8 46
x. 10 46
x. 22 43
xi. 10 118
xv. 10 f.
xvi. 21 65
xvii. 8–12 118
xvii. 14 ff. 118
xviii. 1 68
xviii. 6–8 68
xviii. 7 71
xix. 17 118
xx. 10–15 117
xx. 16–18 117
xxi. 18–21 138
xxiii. 3 (4) 117
xxiii. (4) 101, 117
xxiii. 7 (8) 117
xxiii. 8, (9) 117
xxiv. 8 123
xxv. 17–19 117
xxxi. 15 94
xxxiii. 8 ff. 56, 67
xxxiii. 10 123

JOSHUA

iii. 3 f. 93

JUDGES

v. 2 ff. 95
xiii. 19 61
xvii. 7 67

1 SAMUEL

ii. 36 122
v. 11 93
vi. 9 f. 93
xiv. 33–35 61
xx. 6, 29 62
xxv. 11 62
xxviii. 24 62

2 SAMUEL

viii. 102
viii. 18 67
xii. 6 126
xx. 26 67

1 KINGS

i. 50 f. 64
ii. 27 72
ii. 28 ff. 64
ii. 39 72
iv. 5 67
viii. 55 ff. 77
viii. 63 122
xii. 31 72
xviii. 29, 36 133
xviii. 30–32 61
xx. 23, 28 108

2 KINGS

iii. 20 133
v. 17 61
xvi. 15 133

ISAIAH

lxiii. 1–6 118

JEREMIAH

xxxii. 133
xxxiii. 17–24 72
xlviii. 47 117
xlix. 6, 17, 18 118

EZEKIEL

xxii. 26 130
xliv. 6–16 68 ff.

HOSEA

iv. 6 131
viii. 11–13 132

JOEL

iii. 19 118

AMOS

ii. 4, 12 132

OBADIAH

Book of 118

MALACHI

ii. 72

PSALMS

lx. 102

NEHEMIAH

v. 5 138

I CHRONICLES

xxiii. 28, 31 74

INDEX II.[1]

Aaron, death of, 8 f., 57; name of 96 f., priesthood of, 24, 77; unitary character of, 116.
Abiram, 48 ff.
Abraham, unitary character of, 116.
Addis, Mr., 95 f., 97.
Altars, 60 ff.; horned, 64; lay, 63 ff.
Amalekites, 117.
Ammon, 117.
Angels as criterion of sources, 97.
Aquila, 23 ff., 29.
Arad, 50 ff.
Aram, Aram-naharaim, 101 ff.
Aramaic, see Targums.
Archæological evidence, 138 f., 140 f.
Ark, 53, 55 f, 92 ff.
Astruc's clue, 12 f., 113; tested, 25–38.
Balaam, 101 f.
Bikkurim, 66.
Bilhah, 114 f.
Bondmen, free, 79.
Cain, see Homicide.
Canaanites, 117.
Carpenter, Dr. J. E., 11, 26 f., 48, 84, 98 f., 134.
Characters, unitary, 116.
Chronicles, 70.
Chronology of Numbers, 57, see also Colenso.
Cleanness, and uncleanness, laws of, 128.
Colenso, Bishop, on the family of Judah, 43 f.; answer to, 44 ff.; on the chronology of Numbers, 57 f.; on the numbers of the Israelites, 56 f.
Cox, Rev. A. P., 31 f.
D, 15, 60, 66, 86, 137, 138, 140, 141.
Dathan, 48 ff.
David, 67, 77, 110.
Deborah, song of, 95, 96.
Decalogue, 111 f.
Deluge, 140.
Deuteronomy, 111 f.
Development, see Graf-Wellhausen.
Dienstehe, see Jacob, service of.
Dinah, 115.
Documentary theory, 12 f., 14 ff.,
Doublets, 11, 42, 98 f.
Dreams as criterion of sources, 97 f.
Driver, Dr. S. R., 35, 103 f., 107 ff., 135.
E, 15, 26, 27, 30, 33, 34, 38, 46, 55 f., 67, 83, 84, 85, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 113, 116, 135, 139. See also JE.
Edom, 117.
Eerdmans, Professor, 106 f.
Elohim, 13, 15, 26–38, 63, 84, 85.
Elohist, 13 f., see also E, P.
Ezekiel, 68 ff., 110, 122, 130 f., 133, 144.
Ezra, 123.
Festivals, Calendar of, 11.
Firstlings, 78 f.
Fur, manifestus, nec manifestus, See Theft.
Gilead, 100 f.
Girdlestone, Canon, 19.
Glosses in Massoretic Text, 40 ff., 109.
Goshen, 102.
Graf-Wellhausen Theory, 16, 35. See also Wellhausen.
Gray, Dr. G. B., 92 ff., 101 ff.
Greek Versions, see Aquila, Septuagint, Symmachus, Theodotion.
Green, Prof. W. H., 106, 117 f.
Gunkel's Genesis, 35.
H, 15, 120, 130, 131.
Hamul; see Hezron.
Haran; see Aram-naharaim.
Heave-offering, 78.

[1] The table of contents should be used to supplement this index.

Hexateuch, 13, 81 f., 85 ff., 105, 107, 112, 144.
Hezron and Hamul, 43.
Hierarchical organization; see Priests.
Historical reconstruction, 17.
Holiness, Law of; see H.
Homicide, Law of, 137, 139 f.
Horeb, 96.
Hormah, 51.
Hosea, 131 f.
House of God, 63 ff.
Interest, Laws of, 143 f.
Ira, the Jairite, 67, 77.
Ishmael, 29 f., 33.
J, 13 f., 26, 27, 28, 30, 34, 38, 46, 83, 84, 85, 88, 94, 95, 98, 99, 101, 105, 113, 116, 134 f., 139.
Jacob, marriages of, 44 f.; service of, for Rachel and Leah, 42, 135 f.; Unitary character of, 116.
JE, 15 f., 63 f., 66, 85, 86, 99, 114, 115, 116, 137, 138, 140, 141; see also E, J.
Je, Jj, 34.
JED, 15.
Jeroboam, 133.
Jerome, 21.
Jethro, 20.
Joseph, Story of, 8 f., 46 f.; unitary character of, 116.
Joshua, 53 ff., supposed priesthood of, 55 f.
Josiah, 62, 67 f.
Jubilee, 10 f., 80.
Judah, and Tamar, 138; family of, 43 ff.
Kadesh, 50 f.
Kautzsch, Professor, 94 f., 105.
Kittel, Professor, 105.
Korah, story of, 43 ff.
Kuenen, Professor, 35, 95.
Laban, 100 ff., 114 f., 136; unitary character of, 116.
Land laws, 144.
Laws, argument for, 10 f., 58 f.; consistency of, 66 f.
Leah, 114 f.
Levites, 10, 55 f.; cities of, 112; priests and, 67 ff.
Loans, laws of, 144.
Machpelah, cave of, 136 f.
Manna, 99.
Manslaughter, law of, 127.
Marriages with aliens, 121.
Massah; see Meribah.
Massorah, Massoretic Text, 18 ff, 30 f.
Meal-offerings; see Sacrifice.
Meribah, 11; Massah and, 42, 98 f.
Mesopotamia; see Aram-naharaim.
Midianites, war with, 121.
Moab, 117.
Mohar; see Jacob, service of.
Moriah, 108.
Moses, unitary character of, 116.
Murder, law of, 127.
Naaman, 64, 66.
Name of God, revelation of, 39 f.; see also Tetragrammaton.
Narrative, evidence of, 128 f.
Numbers of the Israelites, 56.
Oaths, law of, 128.
Offerings, customary lay, 65; national, 65; statutory individual, 65.
Order, derangement of, 49 ff.; perplexities of 143 ff., 145.
Orr, Professor, J., 84, 99, 104 f., 109.
P, 13, 26, 27, 30, 33, 34, 38, 60, 66, 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 85, 86, 88 f, 98, 99, 105, 112, 114, 115, 118 ff., 128 ff., 136, 137, 139, 141.
Paddan-Aram; see Aram-naharaim.
Patria potestas, 138.
Ph; see H.
Post-Mosaica, the, 107 f.
Pre-Mosaic materials, 134 ff.
Priestly Code, see P.
Priests, priesthood, 10, 55 f.; and Levites, 67 ff., 122, as teachers, 131, in Ex. xix., 24.
Quails, 11, 99, 129.
Rachel, 114 f., 135 f.
Redactor, 15, 27 f., 84 f.
Representation, differences of, 14.
Reuben and his children, 138.
Revised Version, mistranslation in, 54.

"River," "The," 100 f.
Rock of Israel, 96.
Sacrifice, 60 ff., 122 f., 132; see also Offerings; in the Graf-Wellhausen theory, 16.
Samaritan Pentateuch, 7 f., 20, 25, 49.
Samuel, 67, 76 f., 110.
Sanctuaries, Wellhausen on, 60 ff.
Schlögl, Professor, 36.
Security, laws of, 144.
Seir, 95 f.
Septuagint, 19 ff., 29 ff., 42, 49, 52, 77, 108.
Sinai, 95, 96.
Skinner, Principal J., 31 ff., 35 f., 39.
Slaughter, 60 ff., 120 f.
Slaves, 10 f, 79 f.
Sodom and Gomorrah, 129, 134 f.
Solomon, 67, 77, 122.
Strangers, law of, 128.
Style, argument from, 81 ff.
Succession, intestate; see Zelophehad, daughters of.
Symmachus, 23.
Syria; see Aram.
Syriac Version, 20, 21, 25, 35, 57, 108.
Tabernacle, 9, 53 ff.
Targums, 21, 25.
Tent of Meeting, 9 f., 53 ff.
Tetragrammaton, 12 f., 26–38; see also Name of God.
Textual Criticism, 18 f.; evidence of, 28 ff.; legitimacy of, 21 f.
Theft, law of, 126 f.
Theodotion, 23.
Theophany, 61 ff.
Tradition, testimony of, 141 f.
Transpositions; see Order, derangement of.
Toy, Professor C. H., 37.
Unity, signs of, 113 ff.
Variants, Hebrew, 28 f, 32, 33, 34.
Versions, 18 ff.
Vocabulary, differences of, 14.
Vulgate, 21, 25, 35, 42.
Wellhausen, 35, 55, 67, 113; see also Graf-Wellhausen, Sanctuaries; on Priests and Levites, 67 ff.
White, Dr. G. E., 103 ff.
Wright, Professor G. F., 141.
Zabud, 67, 77.
Zadok, sons of, 69, 72.
Zelophehad, daughters of, 124 ff.
Zilpah, 114 f.

Date Due

My 18 '39

MAY 26 '65

BS1225 .4.W644
The origin of the Pentateuch,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00012 1824